1. Approval of Agenda
   a. Justin moves to approve the agenda; Erik seconds the motion. Motion carries.

2. Announcements
   a. Max shares that the ISA is selling samosas today in the Quarry Plaza until 3:30 pm
   b. CSF Meeting report
      i. CSF meeting was held at UC Irvine last weekend. Ceril shares that there was information shared about the current campaigns.
      ii. The next meeting is in late April, and all campaigns are expected to be finished by then. Ceril asks if anyone is interested in attending? Ceril, Noora and Clara will be attending. Are there any other interested committee members? Clara reiterates that this is a great opportunity for anyone interested in taking on leadership role in SFAC.
      iii. Clara shares information about the CSF Student Success Fee issue at CSU’s, regarding campus based fees being used for tenured faculty. This is concerning because CSU is suppose to be a system like UC, but one campus has made this decision independent of the others.

3. Funding Proposal Review
   a. Erik explains that issues continue to persist around graduate student employment; he proposes that SFAC augment any funding allocations (regardless of whether the unit requested this) related to GSR positions to ensure that units can accommodate for the full cost of tuition.
      i. Justin expresses concern around providing more funding to units then requested.
      ii. Clara expresses concern regarding the committee’s role in assigning M7 and SSF for the purpose of tuition.
      iii. Peter explains that he would want to dialogue with units to ensure a funding model which would allow for the appropriate support for GSR.
      iv. Justin suggests that when working on metrics for next year, the committee should be more explicit about this type of issue.
   b. Pathways to Research:
      i. Clara suggests a similar model to last year, that we provide 1 or 2 years of funding for pilot programs given that we don’t have a lot of permanent funds.
      ii. Erik suggests that the student employment piece is not adding up. Clara responds that it looks like the stipends are for two quarters - Winter and Spring.
      iii. Faye asks for what our general approach to the discussion will be, for instance would we do a straw poll? Ceril says it seems too early to vote; he would like to review all of the proposals. Clara responds that perhaps we could do a straw poll and earmark funds, and continue with a declining balance.
      iv. Peter moves that someone keep track of the ongoing discussion and earmarked amounts, etc. via a separate tracking other than the minutes.
      v. Committee discusses approaches to tracking ongoing tentative budget decisions.
vi. Erik suggests using the SFAC committee resources page to track ongoing provisional allocations.

vii. Clara asks Erik about his thoughts on the stipends piece of the proposal.

viii. Peter explains that the stipend for the purpose of off-setting employment is not as critical as the stipend going toward grad school applications, prep courses, etc. However, he wants to ensure that funds go toward their intended purpose through some reimbursement system. Erik says that he thinks grad school application fees can be waived for needy students.

ix. Clara asks what if we funded $200 per quarter, instead of $300? Peter responds that the funds can still be used toward whatever the student wants.

x. Justin says that the idea of reducing employment commitments resonates with him because sometimes students don’t participate in these kinds of programs because they need to work.

xi. Erik motions that we remove funding the $90,000 from the proposal for the student stipends. Tony seconds the motion. Results of vote: 3 - Yes, 7 – No. Motion fails.

xii. Erik motions that we fund the full proposal for three years out of one-time SSF funds. Total allocation is: $152,197.20. Clara seconds the motion.

1. Peter asks about his idea that there be a contingency placed on the stipend via a reimbursement method.

2. Clara agrees with Peter’s suggestion, however, the timing and reimbursement schedule may not work out. Clara suggests that we could ask the unit to make sure the expenses are tracked for their intended purpose.

3. Charlsie expresses concern that we allocate $150K which is considerable amount of the entire budget.

4. Result of Vote: Yes - 9, No-0 , Abstention-2. Motion passes.

5. Lucy C. asks if we can omit funding for programming, given that the unit may be able to absorb. Free points out that the unit is already putting in approximately $45K of their unit budget into this project.

6. Lucy C. moves that we remove $4500 from the allocation ($1500 per year). Vote: 9-Yes, 0 - No, 2-Abstention. Motion carries.

7. Provisional amount: $147,679.20 – SSF (the entire request, except the $4500 programming)

   c. John follows up on Charlsie’s question regarding the approach to utilizing such a high funding amount right at the beginning of the process. There is a discussion regarding the quality of the proposals submitted this year in comparison to last year.

   i. Max says that his college tries to use the funds so that students who are receiving services are doing so in the year they pay the fees.

   ii. Lucy C. says that our mentality throughout this process should be to allocate what’s necessary for the program, but not have the mentality that we need to spend it all.

d. Accessibility, Leadership, Internship Team

   i. Clara says that overall this was a strong proposal, but the internship job description seems somewhat vague. The outreach and marketing that the student interns focus on should be student services type of activities, not outreach for note-takers and other academic support functions.

   ii. Faye makes a motion that we allocate SSF one-time funds for this project, and that we include the notes from Clara that make clear to unit the academic concerns. Intern
duties should not be used for academic functions. Lucy C. seconds the motion. Result of vote: Yes-10, No-0, Abstention-0

4. Capital Projects Updates
   a. Proposal #1: OPERS – Dr. Andrea Willer of OPERS
      i. Lockers are underutilized on the first floor.
      ii. Create a “store front” in this space for outdoor rentals, booking trips, student lounge, healthy food concept.
      iii. Andrea is here for two reasons: 1) ask for committee’s concurrence of the concept; 2) approval to use $26,000 of SLF 1 for the design and planning process.
      iv. Erik asks what happens to second floor space? Andrea responds that the second floor space would be the new home for the expanded experiential learning program.
      v. Clara asks about what happens to the existing lockers. Andrea responds that they would be relocated to other existing locker spaces.
      vi. Clara asks about the long term plans for renovating OPERS? Andrea responds that she continues to work on a long term plan, however it would require a significant referendum. Andrea explains that OPERS will need to go to referendum next year because SLF 1 is sun-setting in 2017. Faye asks what happens if the $26K investment is made and the results of analysis are that the cost the project is much higher than anticipated? Andrea responds that OPERS has done a lot of homework on this project and is confident with the estimated costs. If the costs came in too high, then she would scale back maintaining the purpose of the updated space.
      vii. Erik asks whether there is any plan to incorporate student feedback on this project? Andrea responds that there has been a lot of consultation with student interns at OPERS to flush out the initial idea, and she is open to conducting focus groups.
      viii. Peter reminds the group that sustainability is a value of the university and the outdoor rental program serves an amazing service for students to rent high quality products to at really low costs.
      ix. Tony asks if the OPERS advisory committee has been consulted? Andrea responds that the committee has not met this year.

   b. Proposal #2: OPERS
      i. Wall padding for East Gym. Last year the padding for the West Gym was approved. Andrea explains that the same issue is experienced at the East Gym. There was an internal fix a few years ago, using carpet, but this was inadequate.
      ii. Option 1: $6500 in addition to the $26,000 savings from the West Gym project. Option 2: $28,000 for full renovation. Would require gym to be off line for about three weeks.
      iii. Source: Life Safety/Seismic Fee.
      iv. Clara moves that we put these items on agenda next week for a vote.

   c. Seismic Life Safety – Linda Flaherty
      i. ARC renovations that are planned include: enclose opening between first and second floor, remodel former kitchen area to create three offices, break room, kitchen, remodel lobby to relocate reception, building out one or two offices in former reception.
      ii. Need funding for pre-design studies in the amount of $30K, SSF facility reserves.
      iii. Anticipated cost for project is $700,000

5. Adjournment – meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm