Members present: Alice Malmberg; Aaron Manzano; John Steele; Lisa Bishop; Mario Gonzalez; Cathy Thomas; Sylvia Grape; Jessica Xu; Gina Tu; Sabina Wildman; Suini Torres; Kiryl Karpiuk; Amanda Kazden; Chandler Moeller; Ben Leeds Carson

1. Announcements, Approval of Agenda
   a. Gina motions to approve the agenda. Aaron seconds. Motion carries by consensus.
   b. John reminds everyone about the lobbying opportunity in Sacramento. Anyone who is interested, please follow up with John directly.
   c. Gina reminds the group that the funding call review deadline is approaching and is due by Wednesday, February 8 at 11:59 PM.
   d. John announces that Marlene Tromp has been appointed as the new Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor, effective June 1st. For details, please see the campus-wide announcement.
   e. Aaron asked for budget clarification regarding the BOLD intervention funding proposal; Mario will be in touch with the author and check in with the committee with an answer.
   f. Mario tells the group that if they have any technical issues or questions, to contact him via email.

2. Referendum Presentations and Discussion

   Intercollegiate Athletics Fee
   - On behalf of OPERS, special guests include Andrea Willer, Executive Director and Paul Simpson, UCSC alum of Kresge College who is assisting with the development of Athletics Referendum language and plan.
   - The referendum is an effort that started in Spring of 2016; OPERS solicited student input around athletics & what the campus ultimately wanted out of the program. There was specific attention to what the student sentiment was around campus fees & what students wanted to see regarding athletics.
   - One of the long term goals is to build a sustainable intercollegiate program within Division III. Division III teams do not offer athletic scholarships; the goal is to remain within Division III and not change divisions. The goal is to create a new structure for fees & ultimately decrease the fees in the long run.
   - In creating the OPERS model, the staff looked at many other peer groups within Division 3, to ensure that the program was being built around what would be considered an average Division III athletics program.
   - In doing so, the staff isolated groups like UC Santa Cruz that don’t have football teams, among other criteria, to see what the appropriate budget would be. They looked at roles & responsibilities of their staff, considered what’s different at UCSC that is different on other campuses. For example, athletics doesn’t have buildings that other campuses do have.
   - Under the current model, student fees make up 23% of the budget. The proposed referendum would include an FFE, which stands for funding functioning as an endowment.
   - The plan is that in 25 years, the fee will be subject to a review for sunset.
OPERS is proposing a $45 fee. Of this fee, 33% would go back to aid; 59% will be set aside to fund intercollegiate athletics; and 7% will be set aside for financial assistance for EOP students who may need financial assistance in affording such programs.

Gina mentions that in the ballot language, the percentages don’t add up to 100 but instead add up to 99. Paul says this is due to rounding, but will go back to make the correction.

Sabina asks how the fund will affect EOP students directly. She also asks what outreach the offices will do if this fund passes. Throughout this process, OPERS has worked in collaboration with Pablo, Executive Director of EOP. The idea is that EOP students will be able to, on a need-basis, receive financial assistance to take rec. classes, participate in scuba lessons, etc. EOP students will need to apply for such need-based scholarships; they will apply through EOP and EOP will administer the scholarships.

Alice asks what the oversight or mechanism will be in 25 years when the fee is subject to review. Specifically, will there be oversight from athletics from raising a new fee? Lisa tells the group that if the fee were to be raised, it would have to go through the referendum process.

In relation to Alice’s question, Lisa says the ballot language needs to be more specific—who’s doing the review—Is it the EVC? Who are the decision makers? When would that be done?

Andrea reminds the group of the existing fee, which has language like the one Lisa is suggesting. The fee was passed in 1985; constitutes $15 per student, per quarter.

John proposes to change the language to have it say that the fee will sunset at some day, and would be reviewed immediately following the sunset goes down. Another option would be for the fee to be subject to review the year before it would be expected to sunset.

Sabina asks if the student enrollment increase was considered in creating the budget plans. Paul says they looked at historical enrollment numbers & long-term plans to guess at to how the population might grow.

Aaron comments that he lived on campus for 2 years, but did not see promotion/outreach regarding games or athletics events. He asks if this fee were to pass, would there be a focus on advertising and outreach? Andrea says that historically, the program has been underfunded and understaffed. While the staff recognizes that they have not engaged students and advertised, if the fee were to pass, students will see an improvement in promotion and marketing, as the budget will give them a model to be able to do that.

Gina says that by looking at the 3 year projection, and just about breaking even in 2019-2020, what reassurance is there that the program won’t go into a deficit? Paul says that what will drive the maintenance of the budget is the camps & other. Gina says that breaking even for 3 years is concerning—what’s the difference between FFEs? Paul explains that the FFE is funding as an endowment and how it will operate; also notes that there are 2 separate FFEs.

Lisa asks how much money will come out of the endowment? Paul responds by saying that the endowment will be managed by the UC Regents, per UC Regent policy. The campus can only take out 4.20% per year.

Kiryl asks what the interest is for the FFE, to what Paul says that 6% is the target for the invest firm, and will stay at about 5 or 6%.

Sabina asks what kind of expenses are considered operating expenses? Paul says that these include costs that don’t go under Division III—expenses such as trainers, training costs, promoting & marketing materials, social media, and anything else that doesn’t fit under the other categories.

Lisa asks who will be paying the fee? Will it be graduate and undergraduate students? She reiterates the need for the ballot language to be specific with all logistical information, including who will pay, when will it start, etc. Paul tells the group that both undergraduate & graduate
students will pay. Andrea says they will work on giving more detail on operating expenses and asks the group if they want to see that on the ballot itself?

- Sabina asks what the program will look like if the fee were to not pass? Paul tells the group that if the fee does not succeed, athletics will go away completely, and the Chancellor has made it clear. If a plan to create a sustainable athletics model is not implemented, the campus will not be able to support athletics. UCSC will be at a deficit and cannot go down to another level, as Division III is the lowest division.

- Sylvia asks how students are feeling about paying the $45? Paul says the staff has spoken to over 500 students and has received a general consensus that they want to pass a lower fee in an effort to reduce student fees in the long term.

- Aaron asks if the fee does not pass, what will happen to the existing $5 fee? Lisa says the Chancellor or EVC can sign off and remove the existing fee.

Measure 8 Fee

- Alice transitions the meeting to discuss the Measure 8 and Undocumented Student Fee--how are the colleges feeling?

- Four members agree that their colleges were in support of both. Two colleges are in favor of supporting the undocumented student services program, but have mixed feelings and oppose the Measure 8 fee increase.

- Sabina mentions that there is a problem with transparency within SUA and how their budget is being used.

- Gina points out that the numbers on the SUA ballot language are wrong as they don’t add up correctly. She also shares some concerns on last page, specifically relating to how the fee will be used. In the last subheading, it reads that the increase for the advisor wages and salary will increase by 3% every year. Within the 1st year, this amounts to $2,000.

- Gina mentions how there are concerns about moving the food pantry off campus and the stipends, as she worries there won’t be enough money for this and the advisor’s salary increase.

- Alice will send out Gina’s questions and Tamra’s answers to the committee.

- Jessica asks if the author can change the amount on the ballot language; Mario will ask Lucy and report back to the committee.

- Chandler shares that in his discussions, SUA representatives were against the fee increase, stating that currently, money has not been spent well.

- Kiryl shares that the referendum has not been brought to the assembly for review.

- Jessica shares that in her spaces at College 10, her constituents were supportive of the fee increase.

- Aaron shares that Stevenson students hope an increase in the fee will help SUA address these issues. Chandler, however, comments that his constituents disagree and think SUA should first address these problems before attempting to raise the fee.

- Sabina asks how often SUA put on events? She notes that the colleges, RAs and student organizations are already putting on events, and asks what the need is for SUA-run events?

- Jessica asks how the current funds are being used, or misused? Kiryl says there is not much discussion. Gina: says some money is going to SOFA. Mario invites the committee to see a line by line budget available on the SUA website.

- Sabina asks where the student government fee funds are currently going? If students involved with student government spaces don’t know, there is hesitation that other students who are not involved probably don’t know where their money is going.

- Gina states her general concerns with the fee increase, specifically in relation to the stipends and advisor’s salary increase, the emphasis on programs, and overall lack of transparency on
how the funds are being used. Gina asks where the 3% salary increase for the salary advisor is coming from—why that number? Mario responds by saying that the 3% could be for the non-represented staff performance salary increases that take place at the end of the year. John says that the former President of the University of California, Mark Yudoff, established the cost of living adjustment (COLA) after the economic recession, and that such increases have become merit-based. Such salary increases have therefore become harder to get, and are based on uniform performance evaluations that take place between the employee and the supervisor.

- Chandler references the questions and answers shared by Alice, asking members not to share the full text, but rather paraphrase what the answers from the author say.

**Undocumented Student Services Fee**
- Alice asks the group why the committee is deciding to endorse the undocumented student services fee.
- Gina says that the referendum fee will offset potential defunding from UCOP. She also supports the fee, as it will be under oversight of 6 different people. Chandler supports the fee because doing so shows solidarity with the undocumented student community during a time of uncertainty. John says that it is important to have a diverse student population.
- Alice will send the committee’s thoughts to Mario and Lucy, who will write it into a cohesive sentence & send out to Alice and the SFAC for approval before finalizing.
- Vote: 12, yes; 0, no; 0, abstentions. Committee unanimously votes to support the fee and to approve the reasons for doing so.

**3. Discussion and Vote on Summer Campus Based Fees for 2017**
- Lisa says the committee does not need to vote on summer fees at the present meeting, and can introduce the item at next week’s meeting, as it still needs to go through her management review, including Vice Chancellor Delaney.
- Alice says the summer session fees are currently set at $287, and asks the committee how they feel about keeping the fees at the same level? Lisa says they will stay at $287 unless SFAC wants to present something to the EVC and Chancellor.
- Alice asks the committee if they need more time to make a decision, and the group agrees they need more time to consult with their constituents.

**4. Adjournment**
- Sylvia motions to adjourn the meeting; Gina seconds. The motion carries by consensus. Meeting is adjourned at 2:03 PM.