

Student Fee Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
February 28, 2021
2:00pm - 4:00pm

Present: Alvin Ho, Charlene Proo, Chloe Mietzel, Isaac Karth, Mathew Sarti, Venkatesh Nagubandi, Gloria Qiu, Sue Carter, Vivian Pham, Lisa Bishop, Lucy Rojas, Lydia Jenkins-Sleczkowski, Emily Montano

1. Welcome and Introductions
 - a. Welcome to the weekend meeting! Brynna thanks the group for showing up on a weekend.

2. Approval of Agenda and [February 24 minutes](#)
 - a. Alvin motions to approve the agenda, Gloria seconds. No objections, motion passes.
 - b. Isaac motions to approve the minutes, Mathew seconds. No objections, motion passes.

3. Funding Proposal Discussion
 - a. Links
 - i. [Google folder](#)
 - ii. Ranked [Evaluation spreadsheet](#)
 - iii. Fill out thoughts ahead of time: [Running document](#)
 - iv. Lisa confirms at the beginning of the meeting that \$158,000 has been allocated, with \$241,000 left.
 - b. Proposals
 - i. #19, [Graduate Student Diversity, Wellness, and Retention](#), \$240,987
 1. Isaac summarizes that the proposal is asking to hire graduate student interns to work at the resource centers to extend the current support offered to graduate students at the units. They are estimating a reach of 1,000 people. Isaac notes that this seems like a highly ranked proposal among the committee. He suggests funding one student.
 2. Discussion around wording of the funding, ie FTE or salary equivalent of one graduate student.
 3. Isaac motions that funding a total of \$19,160.17, second by Venkatesh. Motion passes.
 - ii. #22, [Resource Centers Student Employees](#), \$196,182
 1. Matthew suggests if we do the same process since they are cheaper

2. Brynna confirms they are cheaper and work less hours
 3. One suggestion is to finance one graduate student
 4. Alvin says it depends on what study we fund
 5. Lucy suggests is saying work study as part of the language since this stretches it by double and will help the unit
 6. Alvin motions funding 10 work study positions for \$23,335 for the units to divide as needed. Second by Charlene. No objection, motion passes.
 7. Brynna mentions that there is a difference of about \$4,000 which is a 20% difference between the graduate employee proposal and the undergraduate proposal. The group does not object to this funding difference.
- iii. #5, [Honoring Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls](#), \$7,410.00
1. Brynna says they are asking for tshirt, flyers, decorations, speaker fees, etc.
 2. Discussion around what items to fund. Brynna notes that she usually does not support funding for T-shirts, but likes how this program utilizes them.
 3. Matthew motion to fund speaker fees and healing circles which comes out to \$4,000. There are no seconds, motion does not pass.
 - a. Alvin objects.
 4. Alvin motions to find \$5,760 for programming and flyers. There are no seconds, motion does not pass.
 5. Charlene motions to fully fund proposal five. Seconded by Matthew.
 - a. Motion objected by Alvin.
 - b. Motion passes to fully fund \$7,410 for proposal #5.
 6. Now in discussion to vote in favor or not in favor of fully-funding
- iv. #39, [Creating Leadership Opportunities and Offering Skill Development to Deepen Enriching Learning Environments at LSS](#), \$84,462
1. Discussion around the budget sheet and the extra pay portion. They factored the number of quarters to the number of students.
 2. Discussion about funding and whether or not they would be able to fund the whole thing themselves and how urgent they need the funding from SFAC. Mathew notes that LSS has other funding sources. Alvin says that the proposal mentions that extra funding expands or creates new programs in the office.
 3. Isaac would like to see the funding for 3 mentors for the quarter and 20 of the tutors.
 - a. Brynna says about \$26,000
 - b. Matthew likes Isaac's suggestion

- c. Isaac seconds
 - 4. Motion by Matthew to fund \$26,383.54 for the 3 mentors + 20 students over 3 quarters. Seconded by Isaac. No objection, motion passes.
- v. #42, [Crossing the Finish Line \(CFL\)](#), \$392,985.00
 - 1. Brynna says in the running document everyone said this was a worthwhile proposal and tackled a great need in our campus.
 - 2. Alvin was wondering if we can clem the student employees and not the counselor since it is a lot of money for that position.
 - 3. Brynna says that the full time equivalent would be 90,000 for one year and it would be cheaper if we scale down to students
 - 4. Matthew supports this decision of just funding the students.
 - 5. Brynna said it would be about \$36,000 for four students, summer payroll included
 - a. $\$35,873.28 = 4$ students
 - 6. Issac recalls that the procedure is to go through all the allocation and then go back and revise. For example, last year SFAC's initial allocations were on target and focused less on revising later.
 - 7. Alvin has suggested funding four students for the whole year.
 - 8. Isaac wants to see 3 students which is about \$27,000
 - 9. Isaac motions to fund 3 students at \$26,904.96 for the whole year. Seconded by Alvin. No objection, motion passess.
- vi. #11, [Slug Shelter](#), \$50,000
 - 1. Lucy wanted to share some concerns. The idea is amazing but the authors did not realize how much money this would cost and whether or not the proposal had realized they would have to go through SOAR and whether or not they would support this program. Maybe providing funding as seed money to do research. It would be prudent to consult the authors and SOAR team. Happy to reach out and do that consultation.
 - 2. Lisa says they need to go through risk services since university would be liable since student and university funds would be paying for this. She suspects that the authors underestimated how much this will cost.
 - 3. Brynna supports this idea of checking in with these programs.
 - 4. Isaac says that they are not super clear on their timeline. Said we already this year we already had a rough precedent of funding for this year and given their vague timeline would not be in play until the current students have graduated. Their idea is great but SFAC may not be the appropriate source of funding.
 - 5. Discussion on the meaning of seed money and Lucy explains what this is. This may require many things such as time, who they

are working with, and may cost a little bit of how to do the research.

6. Alvin motions to not fund proposal number 11.
 7. Matthew suggests funding the group to do more research into their plan and proposal.
 8. Lucy suggests going back to the authors to say SFAC is interested in learning back on your ideas, however timeline is unsure and we cannot offer funding now but they are encouraged to come back in the future with more details. She notes that this proposal was strongly supported by the committee.
 9. Matthew suggests to amend Alvin's motion.
 10. Isaac motions to not fund, but with a stipulation that SFAC reaches out to the group with a message suggesting returning in a future year to request the funding. The message will also include information about having a more set timeline, outlined consultation plan, and in partnership with their SOAR adviser. Seconded by Matthew. No objection, motion passess.
- vii. #24, [Breaking Barriers to Graduate School Fund](#), \$30,000
1. Brynna thinks that this proposal is trying to get at a serious problem as part of graduate school. Trying to lower the burden of the graduate student application of test taking. Thinking if it is appropriate for student fees to pay for someone's admission fees? It would come out for hundreds of dollars per student. But she thinks it is a great cause
 2. Isaac suspects that standardized tests will still apply to disadvantaged applicants and launder to the more privileged applicants. For this year this proposal is a relatively reasonable thing and likes how it is offering material support. Convinced to fund this one at various levels.
 - a. Alvin is an agreement to Isaacs point.
 3. Isaac and Brynna talks about the fees required for graduate testing for applicants in order to apply.
 4. Vivian says this program would offer an opportunity for more students to apply for graduate programs.
 5. Issac says we can't reasonably fund for two years.
 6. Issac motions to fund \$5,000 unrestricted, roughly for a third of everything they are asking for. Seconded by Vivian. No objection, motion passess.
- viii. #33, [EOP Textbook Lending Library Student-Staff Salary Request](#), \$80,217
1. Brynna says they are asking to pay students to work their lending library, colead and two interns. One includes summer funding and one does not

2. Alvin thinks that we are mostly in favor of it. Like the suggestion of \$27,000.
 3. Isaac motions for option b which is not funding the summer funding for one year for the co-lead and 2 interns which comes out to \$27,610,90. Seconded by Alvin. No objection, motion passes.
- ix. #3, [Slug Support Graduate Student Case Manager and Emergency Fund](#), \$201,974
1. Alvin says we can either fund the emergency fund or can fund the slug support case manager.
 2. Lisa made changes to the worksheet since they were including benefits on items that they did not need.
 3. Alvin says we can partially fund the emergency fund.
 4. Lucy says when people give they are more likely to fund the hardship fund that goes back to the sytents than the staff fund. Consistent success of raising money for the hardship fund than for staffing.
 5. Lisa notes that at this point, SFAC only has \$100,000 left to give out.
 6. Isaac suggests for additional support that Lucy was talking about
 7. Brynna suggest to be prudent but not be as low as possible
 8. Alvin siggets to give remainder of the money we have to fund the slug support case manager
 9. Sue says it is okay to fund the staff position at 100k but would have to come back next meeting
 10. Brynna says it comes out to \$97,000 including benefits
 11. Lucy says that iVC Jennifer Baszile would likely fund the second year and would backfill partially if SFAC doesn't fund the whole amount this year.
 12. Matthew motions to half fund the salary position which is \$48,390,000. Seconded by Sue. No objection, motion passes.
- x. #28, [Pathways to Research \(P2R\) Program Proposal](#), \$50,000
1. Isaac thinks this is an interesting way to help current students who are interested in being involved in research or going on to grad school in the future. Santa cruz is an R1 school and extending the ability for students to participate in research is great. They got a bunch of matching funds already lined up. If we fund them to the extent that they are asking for, they are going to give matching funds to a bunch of different places. We can fund them \$25,500 and they would get matching funds from several places. Something to mention in next year's process is to note down if they are getting matching funding from elsewhere.
 2. Isaac motions we fully fund this program for one year of \$25,000 Seconded by Alvin. No objection, motion passess.

- a. Lisa specified that the letter can go mention it goes toward admission tuition
- xi. #12, [Connecting UCSC students and Latinx Farmworker Families in Watsonville and Salinas for Environmental Justice](#), \$112,800
 - 1. Matthew comments it is a good cause. Says we have about \$30,000 for SFAC funding
 - 2. Isaac comments they are asking just for \$7000 for next year for a one time stipend payment, thinking how we can support them just for this year instead of next year
 - 3. Brynna comments they are going by the fiscal year
 - 4. Alvin comments that sweatshirts off the table
 - a. Brynna reiterates that typically clothing wear is off the table
 - 5. Lucy comments that priority is often given to the benefit directly going to UCSC students.
 - 6. Brynna comments if SFAC just funds student employees for this year would be \$28,000
 - 7. Isaac motions to fund them \$28,000 for the student employees for this year. Matthew Seconded. No objection, motion passes.
- xii. #40, [EOP's Black Men's Initiative: Sustaining Campus Efforts in Support of ABC-identifying Men at UCSC](#), \$77,405
 - 1. Isaac motions to table this to the end of the meeting since the link to the spreadsheet does not work. Brynna seconds. No objection, motion passess.
 - 2. Brynna notes the information included on the written proposal, given issues opening the budget:
 - a. BMI Student Staff Payroll - \$30,840
 - b. BMI Program Operation - \$18,365
 - c. BMI Internship Program Payroll- \$27,900
 - 3. Matthew asks if this exudes women or if this is just the title?
 - a. Brynna answers it is geared toward Black men.
 - b. Lucy comments that student groups can be articulated as a focus but no one can be discluded.
 - 4. Brynna would like to say that this program is heavily reliant on SFAC funding and we did not give them funding last year the program did not happen
 - 5. Alvin comments that this sounds like a good opportunity but only 20-30 students and not sure how this impacts the rest of the student body
 - 6. Brynna said we can think of which committees are being served and the amount of students
 - 7. Charlene comments that Black men are a very underrepresented community in academia and ocnsdierign they have had to not add their program in the past due to lack of funding and if anything is

paying a percentage of the student staff payroll and should try to give something. This is a type of student service UCSC should offer to students

8. Vivian agrees with Charlene and this should be something SFAC prioritize
 9. Isaac supports whichever funding is appropriate
 10. Sue supports to fund student staff payroll
 11. Brynna comments 50% of student staff payroll would be \$15,420
 12. Brynna comments that the student staff payroll would go to 5 mentors and internship program would cover summer internships by EOP
 13. Charlene comments for 50% of student staff and 50% operations which is about \$24,602.05
 14. Sue motions to fund 50% of student staff and program operations of \$24,602.05. Seconded by Charlene. No objection, motion passes.
- xiii. #14, [SOMeCA Peer-to-Peer Program](#), \$15,918
1. Isaac motions we fund them for \$5,306. Second by Alvin. No objection, motion passes.
 2. Isaac and Brynna note that this proposal is very well organized and clear. She suggests that this proposal could serve as an outline for what SFAC is looking for during evaluation.
 3. Lisa says SFAC funding is now at the negative of \$1,409
 4. Lucy suggests to put SFAC's operating carryforward into the funding call. It is about \$20,000.
 5. Isaac suggests we can talk about this at the final deliberations
- xiv. #41, [KZSC Business Manager, Year 3 \(2021/2022\)](#), \$75,000
1. Sue comments if they can build a sustainable model
 2. Lisa comments last year we funded 46,500 of the 75,000 they asked for. There are carry forward funds they own.
 3. Lucy comments that the student media councils have its own process and governance and does not know too much of that process. Recall this position is meant to raise enough funding so that it pays for itself and raise a contribution to its budget of KZSC. Guess they didn't make their targets this year.
 - a. Sue comments due to COVID they should have hit those targets. Suggests funding of a third of the portion.
 4. Alvin asked why the total is just the \$75,000
 - a. Isaac says it is because the budget lacked details
 - b. Brynna agrees with Isaacs point
 5. Alvin is inclined to not fund them; lack of clarity makes it hard.
 6. Lisa says the sustaining student media fee and \$400,000 of carryforward and do have other funds available

7. Sue makes a suggestion of not to fund.
 8. Isaac comments they are implying they have no other options
 9. Lisa is unsure how KZSC's carryforward is distributed.
 10. Isaac asks who has oversight of student media council and their funds.
 - a. Lucy says there is a student governance body and their advising and finances are handled through SOAR.
 - b. Lisa comments that student media council fee has the ability to distribute the funds to staff positions.
 11. Isaac asks if we can ask why their carryforward is high
 - a. Lucy says it would be appropriate to ask this question or discuss it with them.
 - b. Isaac suggests we do this to reach out to them with Lydia and Lucy's help.
 - c. Brynna suggests we table this conversation until Spring quarter.
 - i. Brynna clarifies we would push analyzing carryforwards until Spring quarter
 - d. Alvin comments they would like to go ahead with the info they gave us.
 12. Matthew motions to not fund with an added letter explaining we have doubts with their carryforward and not enough clarification with the budget that did not follow the template. Seconded by Charlene. No objection, motion passes.
- xv. #37, [First-Generation *Graduate Student* Programming](#), \$57,842 (tabled to next meeting)

4. Announcements & Updates

- a. No announcements.

5. Adjournment

- a. Isaac motions to adjourn at 4:44PM. Seconded by Charlene. No objections, meeting adjourned.

Upcoming Guests/Topics:

- Funding modification request from Steve McKay
- Funding Modifications to Right Livelihood College from 2019-2020
- Director of Budget and Resource Management Kimberly Register
- TAPS Annual Budget Review
- Discussion of proposed referenda