

Student Fee Advisory Committee
Meeting Agenda
April 6, 2021
3:05pm - 4:05pm

Present: Alvin Ho, Andy Hunynh, Asia Valdivia, Brynna Downey, Chloe Mietzel, Emily Montano, Gloria Qiu, Isaac Karth, Lisa Bishop, Lucy Rojas, Matthew Sarti, Vivian Pham, Lydia Jenkins-Sleczkowski, May Alvarez , Charlene Proo

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda and [March 8 minutes](#)
 - a. Isaac motions to approve the agenda, Alvin seconds. No objections, motion passes.
 - b. Isaac motions to approve the minutes, Gloria seconds. No objections, motion passes.
3. Campus Elections Consultation with Brian Arao and Asia Valdivia
 - a. Asia presents on the update of referendum and how to move forward with the two referenda that are proposed on the ballots for this year
 - i. In order for referendum to pass we need at least of 25% students who are eligible to vote in the election.
 - ii. Asia and Brian are anticipating it will be difficult to meet the 25% given the turnout of students last year. Asia proposes the two options to approach this year's election: to postpone the referendum until next year's election, or to ask the chancellor to lower the voting threshold needed for referendum to pass.
 1. Asia states she and Brian supports option one as well as the Vice Chancellor Bzille, Chancellor Larive and the Sustainability Office and currently waiting for KZSC's decision
 - b. Matthew asks what marks the student eligible to vote?
 - i. Asia responds that students have to currently be enrolled in the spring of 2021.
 - c. Matthews notes that 2019 was over 40% turnout and 2020 under 25%. Did the protests or COVID have to do anything with this decrease?
 - i. Asia responds that one of the main reasons for voter turnout for last year was because it was the first virtual elections and did not provide an environment that students were used to.
 1. Lucy clarifies that voting has been done electronically for 15-20 years and to clarify virtually meaning that campaigning and organizing was happening entirely virtually last year.

- ii. Asia adds that the form and debates were held online. Now that folks are more comfortable, she is anticipating that they will reach the 25% to meet the referendum threshold.
- d. Matthew asks if there is any initiative being made to pull out students or movement towards that?
 - i. Asia responds that SUA has hired an elections and associate elections commissioner who are working on outreach plans for the remote environment. She is unsure how this effect will look.
- e. Brynna asks if there is any harm for the sustainability office and KZSC being on the ballot this year and being on the ballot next year?
 - i. Asia does not think it would be detrimental and proposing this year they would not have not go to the application process or having SFAC or sponsorship support. If fee referendum were on the ballot and failed the process would have to be done again.
 - ii. Lucy adds that there is a lot of labor and time required to have a referendum on the ballot.
- f. Lucy states that option one seems prudent to her. Comments on how she will be cautious about how the two referendums will be put on the ballot automatically with no additional review or Asia or Brian or authors can go back to the groups that are supporting and members who made the statements to clarify their measurement is on the ballot for Spring 2022. Groups need to be notified to reaffirm their sponsorship and statement. Elections office can take this responsibility.
 - i. Asia likes this suggestion. She would envision this happening for next year's elections.
 - ii. Alvin agrees that SFAC should have the opportunity to support and review it.
 - iii. May agrees with this when it is being posed on the ballot
 - iv. Charlene and Chloe agree
 - v. Asia asks what this would look like.
 - 1. Alvin suggests presentation by the authors again
 - 2. Charlene personally prefer the authors, to get answers straight from the source
 - 3. Matthew asks if because of the low turnout last year if people don't want their work to be wasted and trying to change the requirements? If they want their work to not be wasted?
 - a. Asia responds that it is based on last years turnout and the campus commissioners analyzes of what might pass or not
 - b. Matthew asks if no one is in agreement?
 - c. Asia responds that KZSC is still deciding and everybody is mostly supporting option one
 - vi. Asia states that lowering the threshold would not be an appropriate amount of students voting for fees that would be charged for students.

- vii. Asia clarifies that the referendum is for the undergraduate students
 - viii. Lucy comments that the drop for 11.71% voter turnout drop last year demonstrates the impact of campaigning in person.
 - ix. Alvin points out that the TAPS referendum was in 2019 and that caused a lot of voter turnout in particular.
 - x. Brynna asks if there is anything that would change about the voter circumstances?
 - 1. Asia responds that has not seen the outreach plan. Have emails that will be going out campus wide. Voting this year would be one week. Says she can bring those concerns and discuss them with Bryan and SUA elections commissioners. Reached out the GSA officers about the timeline. Explains the concerns of training the officers.
 - 2. Isaac adds that he thinks he would have a hard time convincing GSA to support option two.
 - xi. Alvin suggests to lower the threshold to 20%.
 - xii. Brynna states that overall SFAC seems to support option one and adds on to Lucy's suggestions to have the referendum authors to do their rounds .
 - xiii. Isaac supports this but voices concerns if the threshold is lowered to 20%.
 - xiv. Brynna asks if KZSC remains undecided if you can split and allow the sustainability office to follow option one?
 - 1. Matthew and Charlene think this could be a reasonable option.
 - 2. Asia responds that she will ask her colleagues.
 - xv. Asia comments to either go with option one with revisiting SFAC and sponsorship folks next year. Or explore the option to split depending on what each referendum author would prefer.
 - xvi. Asia leaves her [email](#) and Brian's [email](#)
4. Funding Modification Requests from 2019-2020
- a. We Belong ([request](#), [original proposal](#))
 - b. Right Livelihood College ([old request](#), [new request](#))
 - c. WAVESS/STARS ([request](#), [original allocation](#))
5. Funding Proposal Discussion (tabled to next meeting)
- a. Links
 - i. [Google folder](#)
 - ii. [Running document](#)
 - iii. [Previous award summary](#) (as of March 2, 2021)
 - iv. [Suggestions](#) for next year
 - b. Revisiting previously funded proposals
 - i. \$65,313.90 overspent
 - ii. [Ranked Evaluation spreadsheet](#)
 - iii. Most-funded: [#39](#), [#28](#), [#40](#), [#37](#), [#6](#)

- iv. Lowest ranked: [#15](#), [#9](#), [#20](#), [#10](#), [#29](#)
 - c. Brynna comments that colleges are asking to use the funding they have this year for in person spending when in person for next year and all three are postponements of time
 - d. Isaac motions to approve all three funding modifications from last year, Matthew seconds. No objections, motion passess.
6. Announcements & Updates
7. Adjournment
 - a. Alvin motions to adjourn, Matthew seconds. No objections, motion passess.

Upcoming Guests/Topics:

- Director of Budget and Resource Management Kimberly Register
- TAPS Annual Budget Review