Student Fee Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
November 7, 2016

Present: Alice Malmberg, Grace Shefcik, Aaron Manzano, Sabina Wildman, Gina Tu, Jessica Xu, Lucy Rojas, John Steele, Lisa Bishop, Cathy Thomas, Amanda Kazden, Karen Duek, Mario González, Kiryl Karpiuk

1. Approval of Agenda, Minutes, Announcements
   a. Approval of Agenda
      i. Aaron moves to approve the agenda and minutes; Karen seconded the motion. Motion carried.
   b. Announcements
      i. John reminds the group that this Thursday is the campus budget forum.
      ii. Alice announces that Paul Simpson, consultant on Athletics will be at our next meeting.
      iii. Mario announces that on Wednesday there will be a CalFresh workshop.

2. Funding Call Process
   a. Available funding: Lisa reports that our campus has not yet received the SSF allocation from Office of the President.
      i. $250,000 – SSF (one-time)
      ii. $50,000 – M7 (one-time)
      iii. $1,831 – M7 (permanent)
   b. Timeline
      i. Alice suggests that we send out a call as soon as possible; after the committee determines its process for evaluation.
   c. Alice asks Lucy to review the past practices around funding allocations. Lucy explains that several years ago, SFAC engaged in an assessment process to establish values and priorities for funding. For the last two years, the committee has used a system with a 100 point system, where...
   d. Discussion
      i. Karen asks for feedback from members who have gone through this process in the past. John responds that having a methodology in advance of the review is very important. Lucy explains that having the ranking system is helpful to focus discussion on higher priorities.
      ii. Sabina asks about whether the scores are averages or do we see ranges. Lucy mentions that we can publish the data in any way the committee finds it helpful.
      iii. Karen asks if the criteria have been helpful? Discussion. Lucy reminds the group that it can ask for any information from departments that would be helpful. Group discusses reframing the questions or adding new questions.
      iv. Grace mentions that the scoring system can seem somewhat arbitrary. It would be helpful within the point system to establish a rubric. Scoring all of the proposals all at once was problematic in terms of trying to remember why someone scored something weeks after it was scored.
      v. Sabina recommends tying values to the numbers, such as “strongly agree”, “strong disagree”, etc.
      vi. Karen asks whether the committee reviewed student initiated and staff initiated proposals in the same way? John responds that question #5 addresses that somewhat. Aaron says that #5 might be biased toward students.
      vii. Sabina suggests that #4 or #6 could be expanded to highlight support for programs that support underrepresented student communities.
viii. Alice says that #3, #4, and #7 are similar. Cathy asks is part of #7 is supposed to be part of #8? Karen suggests that the most direct question is: why is SSF/M7 the best source of funding for this project?

ix. Alice mentions if we revise #8, do we reallocate the points?

x. Mario summarizes the discussion thus far on the white board.

xi. Group begins a google doc to edit the funding call evaluation.

3. Adjournment

a. Gina motions to adjourn, Cathy seconds the motion. Motion passes by consensus.