1. Announcements/Discussions
   a. Meeting called to order at 12:24 pm.
   b. Miten motions to approve the agenda. Chandler seconds the motion. No objections; motion passes.
   c. Announcements
      i. Serene warns that there is a phone call coming out stating it’s from campus security; this is a fake message.

2. Funding Proposal Discussion
   a. Women’s Center – Sonia Melitta Montoya $7,444.69 in one time funding for omni-lock system for the Women’s Center.
      i. John explains that he visited the Women’s Center yesterday and they already have omni locks on the doors.
      ii. Lucy and Free explain that they will follow up with Sonia and Capital Planning respectively, to confirm whether this proposal is to be withdrawn? Ayke suggests that we move forward with discussion as though there are no omni locks and then we will check in.
      iii. Miten is supportive given that we funded Women’s Center
      iv. Miten makes a motion to table this discussion until we have more information; Chandler seconds the motion.
         1. Vote: Yes – 9. 0-No. 0-Abstentions
   b. OPERS – Recreation 2
      i. $26,928 request or $23,928 minimum for high level student leadership positions, including the CUIP internship for the OEPRS Recreation.
      ii. Julie says that she is very fond of the ELP program, but she is concerned on how OPERS is using their funding.
      iii. John explains that there is a big divide between Athletics and the rest of the OPERS programs.
      iv. David says that he is indifferent toward this proposal. Students are always seeking leadership opportunities. This is through CUIP program which is a well established program.
      v. Julie provides background on the ELP program.
      vi. Free reminds the group that SFAC funded this program for two years in 13-14 and 14-15
      vii. Miten says that he would not want to lock in the funding right now.
      viii. Serene says that she really likes this program; but it’s a high level of funded. She would be supportive but we should wait until the end of the process.
      ix. Rachel asks a question toward the people who said they would like to wait until the end. Serene responds that there were other programs that were more pertinent that we should prioritize.
         x. David moves to table the discussion until the end of funding discussion. The motion is seconded by Miten.
            1. Vote: 7-Yes. 0-Abstention. 2-No
   c. Crown College – Manel Camps – request is for $2,837/$4,837 for student tutoring for college writing system at Crown.
      i. David states that we are lacking in the writing skills of students. Students are coming and have weak writing skills; this supplements writing skills. The request is for permanent funding and we do not have permanent funding.
ii. Alice says that she is in favor of funding this. Alice is a writing tutor with Merrill and a lack of a writing center and a consistent program impacts the effectiveness of the program.

iii. Serene liked this program. She asks if we funded the Westside writing center last year? Response is yes. Clarification that this program is for Crown students.

iv. Rachel says that the request is for a small amount of funding. Rachel suggests that we fully fund.

v. Miten agrees, he makes a motion to fully fund at $4,837. Alice seconds the motion.

vi. Lucy suggests considering a funding amount to provide two or three years of funding. Free reminds the group that there is $1831 available in permanent funding.

vii. Julie reminds the group that Crown took the winter admits for the Core course.

viii. Miten is not comfortable with permanent funding; this is a pilot program.

ix. Grace says that supplemental tutoring is beneficial for students. Grace is supportive of funding two years for the program. $7,674 is the cost for two years.

x. Serene moves to amend the main motion to fund two years at $7,674. Grace seconds the motion.

1. Vote on amendment: 9-Yes. 0-Abstentions. 0-No.
2. Vote on main motion: 9-Yes. 0-Abstentions. 0-

d. Retention Services

i. Free reminds the group that we set aside $30,000 in permanent funds at the beginning of the year for this purpose.

ii. Discussion regarding what is happening with the ARC café.

iii. David says that this is a continuing issue because funds are needed for maintenance of these expenses.

iv. Julie says that she is supportive of funding but wants transparency on the café portion.

v. The proposal is for the ARC, Third Floor Bay Tree, and Cardiff House.

vi. Discussion regarding the ongoing needs for maintenance.

vii. Ayke suggests that we not split up the proposal

viii. Miten makes a motion to allocate the $30,000 in permanent funds that was earmarked at the beginning of the year. David seconds the motion.

1. Vote 9-Yes. 0-No. 0-Abstentions

e. Early Education Services Beth Root, $7200 for three computers for staff and classrooms that students will be used. Computers are necessary to keep up with the 2015 Dept. of Education regulations on technology in the classroom.

i. David reminds the group that during the tech call last year we funded $5,300 for three desk tops and two lap tops.

ii. Alice says that she didn’t rate this very high. She sees the importance of having early education services, but she doesn’t see the need for a lot of technology in an early education center. Alice says that the oldest computers have already been replaced. She doesn’t see the need to fund the computers.

iii. Miten is ambivalent; he had a low score for this proposal. Miten says that $1700 is being requested for each of the systems. The costs seem inconsistent with the costs for the systems they requested last year.

iv. John says that from an IT prospective, there is always someone telling you that you need to upgrade. In some ways, it is true.

v. Miten agrees with John. If a computer can no longer be updated that’s an issue.
vi. Serene asks for clarification; the request is for staff computers and computers for the children/classrooms. Serene says that it’s important to support education for the children of our fellow students.

vii. Julie says that she has been looking into the child care program; the UCSC program is expensive and she doesn’t understand why we pay a student fee and the cost is still high for students.

viii. John says that we are the only UC without childcare for faculty and staff. Costs may be higher because we are a public agency that has to follow more regulations, as opposed to a private program.

ix. Miten says that Julie’s point is valid, but may not be directly relevant to the request for technology.

x. Julie says that the request is double dipping – we already pay a student fee for child care. Now we have another request for technology.

xi. David says that if we are really interested we could invite Child Care to ask more information and clarification. Ayke says that we can invite them in to ask for a presentation.

xii. Miten moves to table the discussion until we can ascertain that the computers are really needed, and then fund $5,000 if it’s needed.

xiii. Rachel asks for clarification on the motion. Miten responds that we ascertain that the computers are really needed. Ayke reminds the group that we have had other examples where we had questions but we didn’t go to the groups.

xiv. Julie says that she is probably the most hesitant about funding, and believes that SFAC should look into the child care program.

xv. David says that in the future if there is a tech request, we would request the year and model of the technology and the reasons for updating.

xvi. Miten retracts his original motion. Miten makes a new motion to approve $5,350 for computers, the same amount as last year. Rachel seconds the motion.

  1. **Vote: Yes – 7-Yes. 0-No-0. Abstentions – 0**

f. UCPD – Active Shooter – Nader Oweis $5,000 for instructors for the training and student ambassadors.

i. John says that he is supportive of the training, but has concerns about the instructor who taught the class that he attended. The person made some inappropriate comments.

ii. Miten says that there is not a strong relationship between students and PD.

iii. Rachel agrees that there needs to be steps bridged before this happens.

iv. Grace has some concerns about the proposal. She says that there should be more prevention. If she were to do an active shooter training, it would not be with a police department.

v. David says that he has never heard about this program.

vi. Miten agrees with Grace; active training has been offered and PD is not the right channel.

vii. **Miten motions to not fund. Rachel seconds the motion.**

  1. **Yes-9. No-0. Abstention-0**

g. UCPD – Citizen’s Academy. $14,051.

i. Free says that the committee did fund for two years in 12-13 and 13-14.

ii. Lucy asks if anyone has taken the Citizen’s Academy class? David responds no.

iii. Miten says there a lot of things that need to be improved.

iv. Lucy says that she knows students who have completed the class. Also, some of her colleagues have been instructors for the course.

v. Alice says that the course is a 2 unit course through Merrill. She knows a student who took the class last year.

vi. Julie says that our PD is putting out propaganda about our students and safety situations.
vii. Miten motions to not fund. Chandler seconds the motion.

viii. Vote: Yes-9, 0-No. 0-Abstention.

h. OPERS Intramurals, Skippy Givens, $15,000 for student staff.
   i. Serene asks for clarification on what the students do. They referee games, set up, etc.
   ii. Miten is supportive of this primarily because the funds go to student employment.
   iii. Serene is supportive and knows a lot of students who enjoy intramurals.
   iv. David makes a motion to fully fund at $15,000. Miten seconds the motion.
        1. Vote: 9-Yes. 0-No. 1-Abstention

i. Crown College 2 - $4,000 for a Crown College website platform.
   i. Ayke explains that the Provost Manel Camps came to Crown Senate to make a funding request. The website would act as a “facebook” of sorts for Crown College.
   ii. Miten says that it’s not a lot of money, but this should not be paid for by student fees.
   iii. Rachel doesn’t see why you can’t achieve the same thing by advertising a closed Facebook page. Facebook is free.
   iv. Grace agrees with Rachel. There is a College 10 Facebook page that is heavily used. If they want to showcase Crown items publicly, the Crown College website could be used.
   v. Serene asks for those whose colleges have Facebook pages, how many people? Response is thousands. Serene likes the idea. She is skeptical of Facebook; people ignore Facebook.
   vi. Ayke says that coming from Crown, she does not want to fund this. When she first heard about the idea, the Provost had come to Crown Senate. No students had heard of this project. Some students believed that this could be a student project. The budget is unclear.
   vii. Miten has three points: he agrees with Grace and Rachel – Facebook can be used. Making these websites is not a complicated job. He thinks we should not fund this.
   viii. Alice agrees with Rachel and Grace about Facebook. The proposal mentions connecting with alumni. At Cowell they are working on networking between students and alumni through Facebook.
   ix. Ben that one of the things that Manel is asking for is a dynamic website that can be updated by many staff and people. The management would happen at various levels; that flexibility is crucial. As to Facebook issue, he cannot quite agree. Facebook is a great tool, but if we port our information through Facebook, we may be creating more liability given that we are a public institution.
   x. Ayke responds that when Manel came to present at Senate, when asked whether this could be a grad student project, he had trouble asking about it. The idea seems to premature to fund at this point.
   xi. John says that for many years people all over the campus were using different website programs, etc. Now we have WCMS that allows for multiple users and can function in the way that Manel’s proposal describes.
   xii. Miten maintains two websites in WCMS and agrees with John that it has good functionality. When a student graduates, the files are all accessible. The benefit of WCMS is that there is levels of access, ease of posting, etc. We could ask Manel for clarification, but we’ve decided on a structure where we don’t ask proposal authors follow up questions.
   xiii. Ben explains that he is currently teaching classes where he uses an online platform to engage students; a function that cannot be met with any existing campus technologies.
   xiv. Julie says that this is a great idea, however, she is concerned about using student fees for this especially because it is a pilot program that is not proven.
xv. Miten says that he understands some of Ben’s points, but he would be concerned that in a few years the site would have to be updated and require additional funding.

xvi. Alice says that she is concerned about usage. She doesn’t want to invest in something that may not be heavily used.

xvii. Serene says that the minimum is $2500; this is only for Crown students. They will only know if the program works in about 2-4 years after it is integrated into student life. Giving $2000 is not too much. Serene says that she goes to the Porter portal but there is no appeal. She’s not sure if we should provide funding.

xviii. Chandler asks if any other colleges has a similar page?

xix. Rachel says that she has changed her position; she also hears that Ayke’s concern that students haven’t been involved. Rachel suggests we could fund and suggest more engagement with students around the implementation of the program.

xx. John says that Rainbow Theatre has their own website and they cannot manage it.

xxi. Miten supports John’s point; the Porter College website is in the right structure but maybe its missing some content.

xxii. Grace says that she agrees with everything has been said; she had a similar experience that occurred last year with SCOC.

xxiii. Ayke says that at Crown Senate, students were left confused. Off campus students said that they would not use it. Grace says that before moving forward, there should be data that students want this and will use it.

xxiv. Julie suggests that we tell Manel to try again next year. The proposal mentions that RAs will track usage; has this been communicated to the RA’s. There is already an alumni platform that is being developed. We should invite him to come back next year following more consultation.

xxv. Chandler asks if we do not fund, that we suggest they come back next year if they are using the UCSC platform. Julie says that more consultation is needed.

xxvi. Alice motions to not fund. Second by Miten.

xxvii. Serene asks if we are sending feedback, can we suggest that the site be kept interactive for off campus students?

xxviii. Rachel says it’s only $2500 and it’s experimental. If more communication can be fostered with students and WCMS administrators, that would be a good outcome.

xxix. Serene says that when she was a new student, she had no idea what resources were available to her.

xxx. Chandler adds that this year, Merrill had an app for everything Serene mentioned.

xxxi. Miten says that not having a good website is not the same as saying you need money to make a website. The proposal was unclear on who will create the site.

xxxii. **Vote on main motion to not fund**

1. Yes - 5. No-2. 3-Abstentions. Motion carries.

j. **Sailing Team – request is for $16,830 by Kip Wanaselja**

i. Grace says that she liked this proposal. It is similar to Mock Trial. Serene agrees. It is a smaller number of students.

ii. Julie says that she was a little confused; perhaps more than 12 students will benefit.

iii. Alice says that when Dustin came to visit a few weeks ago, he said that sailing is one of the most impacted programs.

iv. Lucy clarifies that the request came from a student. David says that he would be comfortable funding, but would feel more comfortable if the sailing team could have priority but others
could use. Ayke explains that the boats are specific for college regattas and sailing department is not interested in sharing.

v. Miten makes a motion to not fund. David seconds the motion.

vi. Alice says that she agrees with Grace; it’s good to support students and their passions. If we fund, it’s setting a precedent. Alice would suggest amending the motion to fund one boat, half of the requested amount. $8,415. Serene seconds the motion.

1. Vote on amendment to the main motion: 5-Yes. 0-No. 4-Abstentions.
2. Vote on main motion, to fund the minimum amount of $8,415: Yes-5-Yes. 1-No. 4-Abstentions. Motion carries.

k. OPERS Recreation 1 – Dustin Smucker. $35,294 to furnish the study space.

i. Ayke asks for a straw poll. Thumbs up if you want to discuss; middle if you don’t care. Thumbs down if you want someone to make a motion and move forward. Thumbs up is majority.

ii. Miten motions to not fund. Chandler seconds the motion.

1. Vote: Yes-9. 0-No. 0-Abstention
2. Suggestion to OPERS – add Wi-Fi. Ben suggests that we have a future conversation about the standards involved in using student fees for things like furniture and other infrastructure. He suggests that we discuss as a general principle and also that we communicate with those who request for funding, if we agree on a general principle. Alice agrees with Ben, and says that the focus needs to be on developing more housing; everything else should be a special case in order to approve.

l. Physical Education – Dustin Smucker $25,805 for full time sailing instructor for OPERS.

i. David asks about whether we can fund instruction. Response is yes, it’s 0 units and there is a recreation component.

ii. Serene says that there seems to be a double dip with regard to the referendum.

iii. Miten says that we should not fund. Student fees should support things like intramurals and recreation.

iv. Free clarifies that we did vote to fund Rainbow Theatre with stipulation we would come back at the end to review.

v. Miten motions to not fund. Chandler seconds the motion.

1. Vote: Yes-8. 0-No. 2-Abstentions.

m. Disability Resource Center – 5 Proposals

i. David summarizes that the proposals are related.

ii. Free provides some context. The DRC is being evaluated at a campus level given the demand in services for DRC. There is a proposal currently under review by the EVC for additional staff for the DRC at 2.5 FTE. Free suggests that SFAC could put support behind funding the staff position. The staff position may not be necessary.

iii. John says that given that the proposals are related, we develop a funding amount and then DRC can determine how to expend the funding.

iv. Miten says that we probably don’t have enough funding left to do the staff position. If we say we could support but not use SFAC funds, items 2-5 we can discuss on whether to fund. Miten suggests that we remove the staff request item.

v. Julie suggests looking at 2 and 5 first; they appear to be the same proposal. They are funding a program where students would be invited in to talk about disabilities.

vi. Rachel motions to not fund DRC 5 (authored by Catherine Green). Serene seconds the motion.

vii. John says that if we funded three of the proposals the total is $24,910 min. $27,360 max amount.
viii. Miten says that he had strong scores for 3 and 4; he is ambivalent about 2 given it’s for equipment. He is inclined to do 3 and 4 at max amount and 2 at minimum amount.
ix. Ayke asks for thumbs on the staff position: Discussion
x. Miten motions to not fund the staff position, DRC 1, with stipulation that we support the campus efforts.


xi. **DRC 1. Motion: to not fund. Motion passes.**

xii. DRC 2

1. Alice: How big is the event? The request did not specify.
2. John: Curious about the equipment, are they renting or buying the equipment? If bought they could use for other things. The request did not specify.
3. Grace: Request was vague. No idea what they are trying to do, who they are targeting, what are their goals.
4. Miten: At best comfortable with funding minimum amount because the number of students have increased.
5. Serene: In support of the DRC and making their presence more aware on campus.
6. Alice: in support in the general notion, but it is very vague and expensive; this is not an on-going exhibit. Is it going to be successful in impacting students. Skeptical in spending that much money for something that might not be as effective.
7. Miten: students will benefit
8. Miten motions to fund at the minimum level. Serene seconds the motion.
9. **Discussion:** David: this event is not going to be successful to teach students about disabilities.

10. **Amendment: to not fund (Proposed by David, seconded Grace)**

   a. **New Motion:** To fund $0. Vote: 3-2-5 Amended Motion Carries.

11. **Discussion:**

   a. Rachel: We are not experts in this situation.
   b. John: Better way to spend the money would be on 3 /4
   c. Serene: There is a DRC students but with not (no idea what I was trying to say, I’m sorry)
   d. Miten: We should make a decision on the data given to us

12. **Vote on main motion: Motion not to fund. 3-3-4 TIE**

13. Ben: It seems as if we are choosing to fund or not based on the other proposals, not exactly fair

14. John: in agreement with Ben

15. David: The DRC needs to implement the events of DRC 3 and 4 before DRC 2’s outreach program to allow for DRC 2 to be as effective as possible.

16. Grace: There are more long term benefits in the other DRC options.

17. Miten: Likes DRC requests 3 and 4 because it caters to the students’ needs, and it funds student jobs.

18. Motion to not fund has died.

19. **Motion: to not fund 2, and fund 3 and 4**

20. Friendly amendment: deny funding for 2 but fully fund 3.

21. **Discussion:**

   a. Miten: Maybe we should vote on DRC 3 now and vote on DRC 2 at the end
   b. Maybe we shouldn’t mix two and three, because voting for three is now made to vote against 2
   c. **Motion Rescinded**
d. Discussion on DRC 2

Ben: understands the need for the outreach event, the expense of the speaker seems high but assuming their goal is to attract a high profile speaker. Should not fund just bc we don’t know the speaker, should fund but less

e. Miten: the number of students who have utilized the DRC has gone up, and it’s bound to increase, but if a few students benefits from this program it’s going to be beneficial

f. Ben: Outreach in education event, point to reach the entire campus not just the DRC students

g. Ayke: great that this type of event is going to happen. this event will encourage students who have disabilities who are not in the DRC to check out the DRC

h. Julie: should be through SOAR and work with student leaders

i. Serene: Disagree with Julie

j. Rachel: Used to work at the DRC, the language students use in class is demeaning, there needs to more of a widespread understanding of students with disabilities

k. Saying large budget for one event is not the best argument, bc there are other events on campus that

l. Miten: 1. strongly recommend that they outreach to the students. 2. in terms of money: passes the threshold that we should fund. Threshold: funded the sailing team with 8 students. 3. make motion: to fund the minimum.

m. Motion: to fund the min amount (proposed by Miten, seconded Rachel) 7-2-1. Motion Passes.

xiii. DRC 3

1. Motion to fully fund (Miten, Alice)
2. 10-0-0. Motion passes.

3. Funding proposals that were set aside.
   a. Rock and Roll on the Knoll
      i. Julie: Student engaged, planned, full support.
      ii. Miten: Historically, there’s been good amount of students, not a lot of money for the amount of students it serves
      iii. Motion to fully fund (Miten, Grace). Vote: 10-0-0. Motion Passes.

b. Oakes and Stevenson College
   i. Discussion
   1. Alice: In favor of Rainbow Theater, unsure where we stand in funding this because we are not allowed to fund teacher teachers.
   2. Julie: Strongly does not feel as if this is a teacher and class, this is an extracurricular program, zero units. What the whole student body gets out of it is crucial.
   3. Miten: If the policy allows, we should fund.
   4. John: Echos support for the program. Serves people indirectly and those who are underrepresented.
   5. Grace: Has there been money been set aside for this?
   ii. Motion: To confirm the $24500 that we set aside (Miten, Alice). Vote: 10-0-0. Motion passes

   c. AARC
      i. Discussion: Revisiting because there was no graduate reps when we first decided
      ii. Miten: Both grad reps had a high score; very useful, money is going to students, typically money going back to student staffs have been fruitful. In favor in funding.
      iii. Rachel: Remembers that people seemed to be in favor of funding during previous discussion without the reps.
      iv. Motion: to approve earmarked amount (Miten, David). Vote: 10-0-0. Motion Passes

d. Undocumented Student Services
   i. Julie: Recommends funding for one year.
ii. Miten: Do we have the money for 2 years of funding?

iii. Motion: stick with the one year funding that we earmarked (Miten, Chandler)

iv. Vote: 10-0-0. Motion passes

e. CHICANO LATINO RESOURCE CENTER

i. Discussion:
   1. Ayke: Recaps the proposal
   2. Miten: It’s a good program, certainly meets threshold of fees going towards students, not a lot of programs have grad students staffs, ready to fund fully
   3. Serene: Great program, important for grad students. Disproportionate to amount of students serves
   4. Alice: Hours working as a grad student, wonder why is broken down with their tuition?
   5. Miten: Clarification how the graduate student subsidizing is broken down.
   6. Julie: It is 1% but grad students don’t always get the same return on student fees as undergrads do. Lots of return in this program. If we make it a good community for the focused community, then more students are bound to come. Wants to fully fund.
   7. Alice: Agrees with Julie
   8. Miten: Having a dedicated student coordinator would help having grad students in general
   9. Motion: to approve full funding (Miten, Rachel). Vote: 9-0-1. Motion Passes

f. OPERS REC 2

i. Discussion:
   1. Serene: in favor of program, good on hands learning
   2. David: everyone should look at the proposals to see which ones they want to decrease/increase amounts. come with a good reason.
   3. Waiting to make a decision on this funding proposal. Must make a decision on the Women’s Center, and their locks, before we address this proposal.

4. Meeting adjourned at 3:50pm