1. Approval of Agenda, Minutes, Announcements & Discussion
   a. Meeting called to order at 12:33 pm
   b. Approval of agenda and minutes.
      i. 1/8/16 Minutes
         1. David makes a motion to amend the Section D, bullet 3, correct David’s name.
         2. Miten makes a motion to approve with the correction. Chandler seconds the motions. Motion approved.
      ii. Chandler moves to approve the agenda. Miten seconds. No objections, motion approved.
   c. Announcements
      i. Rachel reports that College 9 discussed the SLF request; her college was not aware that there was an issue. The SUGB rep was not present at the college government meeting.
      ii. John announces that he is serving on the CPEVC search committee and he will do his best to represent SFAC. The goal is to have someone identified by summer.
      iii. Alice announces that the Cowell Provost search is down to two finalists. There were public forums last week and both candidates seem very qualified.
   d. OPERS SLF Request
      i. Ayke asks if anyone else had an opportunity to speak with their colleges.
      ii. Alice says that she spoke with her college yesterday and generally, her college is interested in not funding OPERS.
      iii. Grace says that she spoke to her college last night and there was critical feedback about OPERS.
      iv. David states that his college said that both OPERS and SUGB should have access to the SLF reserves. Grace says that some feedback included that the gym is too crowded, and that funding should go into the wellness center. Another comment was that there is an OPERS advisory committee that hasn’t met for several years.
      v. Alice reports that the idea for the study lounge was disguised as an attempt to create a space for student athletes.
      vi. Porter college sentiment was that the space could be better utilized.
      vii. Discussion regarding history of SLF and SFAC involvement as consultative body since the elimination of Student Affairs division and VCSA position.
viii. Ayke says that students at Crown were surprised that they had not yet heard about this project. Ayke asks whether there are any formal motions? Should we continue

ix. Rachel asks for a straw poll on who is interested in funding? Julie asks who thinks we should be making a decision about this request?

x. Discussion continues regarding SUGB, OPERS and SLF.

xi. Rachel makes a motion to not fund the request, and to recommend that OPERS consider other options such as: going to the new SLF committee, returning to SFAC for SSF reserves request, etc. Jonica seconds the motion.

1. Result of Vote: 8 – Yes. 0 – No. 2-Abstentions.

e. External Committee Funding Request

i. Serene shares that the external committee is planning an outreach activity on January 19th and 20th. This will be a collaborative art project that engages a budget exercise on where students want to see fees going. The sub-committee would like to have snacks. $175 total request. Requesting time for Tuesday and Wednesday, with multiple shifts.

1. Serene motions to fund the request. Miten seconds the motion. Motion passes by consensus. $75.00 for coffee. $60.00 for Safeway for food.

2. Funding Proposal Discussion

a. Resource Centers – Nancy Kim

i. Requesting 104,089 (two years); minimum request is for $52,044 (one year) for program coordinator.

ii. Alice says that she shares some of the same concerns that came up last year regarding the DRC request, with regard to the ramp up time for a new staff member, etc.

iii. David says that they have two full time specialists that support the resource centers.

iv. Ayke says that she has heard in the past that program coordinators for the resource centers are needed in different locations. Ayke says that she would be fine funding for one year. They would be able to start strong.

v. Rachel agrees, staff is essential; the resource centers need it.

vi. **David motions to fund the resource centers $52,044 for one year of funding.**

   Miten seconds the motion. Any more discussion?

   1. Vote: 10-Yes. 0-No. 1-Abstentions

b. Oakes and Stevenson College – Regina Langout

i. Request is from permanent funding, which we do not have. The funding is for African American Theatre $24,500 for salary for the instructors for those classes. Ayke asks if this is an appropriate use of SSF? Free responds that this program is instruction, but also cultural enrichment and the class feeds into the theatre productions.

ii. Grace says that this was a low scoring proposal for her. It seems that it is instruction, and this is not an appropriate funding source.
iii. Alice says that this is through the colleges, so it seems appropriate.

iv. Miten says that this appears to be a student outreach program, but the funding is for the instructor’s salary. If we fund, we would be finding a way to do, not convinced that we should do this.

v. Rachel recalls that last year we turned down a proposal for Kresge class. Ben says that we should investigate setting this kind of precedent. Julie also says she doesn’t see why not; the instructor runs the program which is a critical program at UCSC.

vi. John says that this is a phenomenal program.

vii. Julie asks for clarification on who makes the final decision. Lucy responds EVC Galloway. Discussion continues regarding instruction, policy, etc. Free says that when things are not so clear, EVC Galloway will typically defer to student sentiment.

viii. Miten says that the program is important, and the amount of money is not too much compared to the number of students who will be served.

ix. **Chandler motions that we fund $24,500. Alice seconds the motion.**
   1. Vote: 6-Yes. 0-No. 5-Abstentions. Motion carries.
   2. Chandler asks if we can note to come back to this proposal during the final review.

c. **Stevenson $2,845 to assist with Rock and Roll on the Knoll.**
   i. Grace says that the request is for a relatively low amount. It’s a great event with community aspects. There is food.
   ii. Miten asks if there is any issue in establishing a precedent to fund a student initiated event. Miten mentions that there are other organizations with budgets that are for specific student event funding. John asks for clarification on whether a campus wide event is looked at differently than a college specific event?
   iii. Alice is supportive of the proposal.

iv. **Miten motions that we revisit this request at the end of the proposal review process. Serene seconds the motion.**
   1. Vote: 6-Yes. 0-No. 4-Abstention

d. **Arboretum – Rick Flores**
   i. Request is for Amah Mutsun re-learning program. $19,720 for 12,720 – minimum toward salaries for student and grad student heading this program. Funds will be used for programs and community outreach.
   ii. Serene says that she likes this program, that it is student initiated. Miten agrees. It was a good proposal with a good student outreach element.

iii. **Miten motions to fully fund this proposal $19,720. Serene seconds.**
   1. Vote: 8-Yes. 0-No. 2-Abstentions

e. **Career Center – Barbara Silverthorne**
   i. $24,000 for two years, or $12,000 for minimum one year to hire 2 student engagement reps. These would be the first people a student would see when they come to the front desk.
ii. David asks how these positions differ from the current student staff. Alice agrees.
iii. Serene says that the Career Center staff is not very useful; she says it was strange that SFAC is the only possible source of funding. Miten agrees. He did not understand how adding more staff will be useful.
iv. Alice says that it seems like the positions are unnecessary.
v. Miten asks about general observation about the Career Center. His impression is that adding two student positions will not be helpful.
vi. Chandler says it would be a step in the right direction.
vii. Lucy comments on the budget. The numbers seem high. Hiring a work study student could cut the costs in half.
viii. Free says that proposal says it is a new program, but he’s not sure how.
ix. Serene does not find the Career Center useful. Alice agrees.
x. Julie says that she loves the career center and finds the services helpful. The hub program is helpful.
xii. Rachel says that she doesn’t see how this program would enhance operations at the Career Center.
xiii. Jonica says that her experiences with the professional staff have been positive.
xiv. David makes a motion to not fund this proposal; Serene seconds the motion.

f. American Indian Resource Center – Rebecca Rosser
  i. $72,288, minimum $33,644 – for staff, student staff, programming, outreach, People of Color collective.
  ii. Alice says that she liked this proposal and that it connects people of color with topics of sustainability and environmentalism.
  iii. Grace shares Carolyn’s comments which mention concern for how the question about why this is best program to solve the program was answered. Grace has questions about the job. It was not clear how data collection would be conducted. The budget left her with a lot of questions.
  iv. Alice says that this was a concern that she had. Why is the AIRC sponsoring this?
v. Julie says that there was a student here a couple of years ago who identified as Native American and who did research the ENVS program. One outcome of the research was that students of color needed their own space to explore environmental studies. This program connects with all resource centers. There is a currently a student staff member. The program has shifted much of the environmental movement on campus and many more students of color are involved.
  vi. David says that he believes this is a great program and when you think of a movement of people of color, it makes sense to begin in the ERCs. David says that the budget seemed a little inflated, especially related to conferences. He sees this as a great program. Maybe we could fund the student staff portion.
vii. Miten likes the proposal. At the time, he was OK with funding the minimum requested amount. He supports David’s idea of funding the student portion. $68K for staff portion.

viii. David makes a motion to fund $68,936 for staffing. Miten seconds.
   1. Vote: 7-Yes. 0-No. 3-Abstentions

g. DRC-3 – Rick Gubash
   i. $4500 for student staff, outreach, for graduate student orientation.
   ii. David says that in another proposal, DRC asked for student staff. It is confusing to know what is being asked for.
   iii. Rachel says that we should discuss the DRC proposals together as a collective proposal.
   iv. Ayke asks if everyone is OK revisiting the DRC proposals at the end. Response is yes. Serene asks if we can put all four proposals together

h. KZSC – Keith Rozendal
   i. $8600 for mixing equipment
   ii. Serene says that if they don’t get that equipment, the program will be at standstill.
   iii. David is OK with funding the equipment. In order to keep the program running we should fund.
   iv. Julie asks about funding equipment if the radio station will have to decant for seismic work next year. Lucy responds that the seismic work is now scheduled for 17-18, and the equipment from the station would be moved to the temporary location.
   v. Alice motions to fully fund $8600. Chandler seconds the motion.
      1. Vote: 10-Yes. 0-No, 0-Abstention

3. Meeting adjourned at 2:01 pm