Student Fee Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
February 19, 2014

Present: Ceril Fangon, Justin Lardinois, Clara Skaug, Noora Almajid, Free Moini, Tony Tsujisaka, Faye Crosby, Lucy Carrillo, Peter Fabian, John Steele, Erik Green, Brooklynn Ackerman, Charlzie Chang, Lucy Rojas  
Absent: Gabriel Pulido, Max Hufft, Denise Onitsuka, Alma Sifuentes

1. Approval of Agenda and Minutes  
   a. Clara makes a motion to approve the minutes for the February 5th meeting; Noora seconds the motion. Erik objects as he has not had an opportunity to review the minutes. Ceril calls for a vote.  
      i. Straw Poll Vote: 8-Yes, 2-No, 0-Abstention  
   b. Clara makes a motion to approve the minutes for the Feb 12th meeting; Lucy C. Seconds the motion. Motion carries.  
   c. Erik makes a motion to switch item #3 and item #4 on today’s agenda. Peter seconds the motion. Motion carries. Agenda approved.

2. Announcements/Updates  
   a. John shares that the Hunger Banquet is tonight at 7:00 pm at the Namaste Lounge. The program is put on by Oxfam, and is meant to explore issues of hunger in the world.  
   b. John shares that Stevenson College won the meal drive last fall, and Scott and Candy Berlin are hosting an ice cream party at 5:00 pm.  
   c. Tony announces that he will be the lead in Zoolander in the spring.  
   d. Lucy C. announces that she will be studying abroad during spring quarter and will be stepping down from her Merrill Rep and Vice Chair position. She would like to see the replacement Vice Chair selected before the end of Winter Quarter.  
   e. Clara asks if the March 2nd meeting still happening? 10 people respond that they are available, 12pm – 4pm at the Cowell Provost House.  
   f. Miscellaneous Fees Committee: Clara shares with the group that Ceril and Lucy C. have been invited to participate in the miscellaneous fee committee. This is a critical process that needs input from students.

3. Capital Projects Discussion & Vote  
   a. Committee reviews information provided at last week’s meeting.  
   b. OPERS Project #1  
      i. Justin mentions that both he and Peter work at OPERS. What should their role be? Peter says that he will base his involvement on the projects that he is directly involved in.  
      ii. Faye asks whether her two questions were answered regarding: what happens if projects costs come in much higher than anticipated? And how does this project fit into any larger campus plans to renovate OPERS/build new facilities?  
         1. Lucy R. responds that Andrea said that if costs come in higher than anticipated, she will scale back the project. Linda F. responded to the second question.  
         2. Clara responds that her sense from Andrea is that any major renovation would incorporate the existing facility.  
      iii. John expresses concern that one underutilized service is being swapped for another underutilized service. John is concerned that OPERS wants to become a “center” of campus.
iv. Peter responds that he was on the OPERS advisory committee last year and that Andrea presented compelling data which shows how UCSC recreation space is below average of other universities.

v. Free shares that there is $2.4 million in the Student Life Facility 1 Fee. Important to note that this fee is the one that is sun-setting in 2017.

vi. Justin asks what the anticipated costs for the project are? Peter recalls it was $150,000.

vii. Erik moves to approve $26,235, Tony seconds the motion

Results of Vote:
- College 9 – yes
- 10 – yes
- Merrill – Yes
- Oakes – Abstain
- 8 – Yes
- Porter – Yes
- Cowell – Abstain
- Steven – Yes
- SAB – Yes
- Provost – No
- GSA Peter – Abstain
- GSA Erik – Yes
- 8-Yes, 2- Abstentions, 1-No. Motion carries.

c. East Gym Project

i. Clara makes a motion to fully fund this project. Max seconds the motion.

ii. The committee discusses the proposal.

iii. Erik asks whether or not OPERS returned the unused funds from the West Gym project.

iv. Free says that the seismic fee balance is $5 million with three major projects, including the Quarry Amphitheatre, and the life safety phase 1 and 2 in the Campus Life buildings.

v. Clara rescinds her motion.

vi. Erik moves to fund the project at $51,720.

vii. John notes concern that this is a band aid on a band aid.

Result of Vote:
- Cowell – Abstain
- Stevenson - Yes
- College 10 - Yes
- College 9 – Yes
- Merrill - Yes
- Porter – Yes
- College 8 – Yes
- Oakes - Abstain
- SAB – Abstain
- Provost – Yes
- GSA Peter – Yes
- GSA Erik – Yes
- Motion Passes: Yes - 9, No - 0 , Abstain - 3

d. ARC Project
i. Free shares that the current balance is $7 million in the reserves; factored into the balance is $270K in projects that were approved last year.

ii. Brooklynn asks about how projects are funded in housing?

iii. Clara expresses concern that $700,000 for this project would significantly impact the reserve balance. She’s not sure whether the return on investment would be there. Erik agrees and suggests that we invite Linda to come back to further discuss the project. Clara adds that it would be critical to know what the 25-50 year plan is for the ARC. Straw poll on whether to invite Linda Flaherty back to further discuss: 9 people voted yes. Justin makes a motion to table the discussion to next week. Tony seconds. Clara mentions that we don’t know for certain if Linda can come back next week. Justin amends the motion to invite Linda when she can come back. Motion passes by consensus.

4. Funding Proposal Review

   a. UCSC Collegiate Recovery Program

      i. Erik says that this proposal is amazing regarding identifying need, however there is a lack of information regarding why this is the best solution. Erik believes that there is a need, but he is not convinced on the strategies that are being proposed.

      ii. Peter has three line items that he would like to speak about:

            1. Post Doc Position for $50,000: Peter would like to see that the Post Doc be a UCSC graduate student, if the proposal is supported.
            2. Regarding the line item to keep the office open - $23,500 – could we suggest that this be the maximum hours that the office is open, and that hours would be scaled back based on usage.
            3. Computer and printer seems reasonable, but should be deferred to the technology funds.

      iii. Clara shares concerns about the permanent request for the post doc funding. Clara explains that perhaps we should invite the authors to come to SFAC to further explain and ask questions.

      iv. Justin asks about the CUIP program. Ceril provides some information.

      v. Clara says that she is not comfortable funding this proposal. Lucy C. adds that she would like to invite the author in, so we can address now and not table, especially because the campus has gone smoke-free. Clara responds that it wouldn’t be fair to bring in a group and allow them to update their request during this cycle.

      vi. Erik says that some of the questions he has are: where is the office going to be? Has the space been approved? If so, why isn’t that space currently staffed? How many student positions are going to be programming? (Erik says he would only want to staff programming). What is the conference that is referenced? More information/detail regarding the technology request.

      vii. Justin asks whether there is a middle ground between inviting in the group and not funding at all. He is not comfortable with the latter. Lucy C. responds that we can do what we did last year, follow up with the author with follow up questions.

      viii. Erik suggests that if we wanted to give some funding this year, we give some funding for student programming positions; students could be used for outreach, programming, etc. If a space is already identified, the space could be open for events. Erik suggests funding perhaps half of the proposal.
ix. Faye surmises that the post doc will be the lead to develop the program, probably not appropriate for the student interns to develop the program. This may be the missing link between the documented need and the solution.

x. Ceril states that as a student, not as Chair, he would want to fund the first three items on the list. Lucy C. responds that we should consider the proposal as a whole instead of separating.

xi. Erik moves to fund $50k in one time fees to develop the program. Lucy C. seconds the motion. Clara cautions the group that we should check in to ensure that the intended purpose of the proposal can be achieved. Peter suggests that the strategy of hiring the post doc for one year will provide a ramp up year so the post doc can assess program needs, establish program, etc.

xii. Brooklynn states that she has an issue with the comments added regarding the student positions. Regarding funding the post doc position, Brooklynn asks what does this mean? Brooklynn expresses concern that one person would be implementing the project, isn’t that why they need the CUIP interns and other interns?

xiii. Clara comments that if we fund Post Doc only, then aren’t we basically giving the unit a year to create a new proposal?

xiv. Peter responds to Brooklynn that the post doc would be planning and this may be more effective. Erik disagrees with Peter. Erik sees the post doc position not as a planning position, but hiring someone to actually do the work, which addresses the need that has been articulated.

xv. Faye isn’t sure how much direct delivery the post doc would do. Faye explains that in regard to alcohol, there are many outside resources. Faye explains that currently there is a graduate student doing research on campus climate for Muslim and Jewish students. Faye would like to see assessment and planning, some direct delivery, and research into other fund sources.

xvi. Erik reiterates his motion that we provide CAPS with $50K for a post doc, to provide programming for the year, direct services, and prepare for a long term plan for the campus’ recovery population.

1. Results of Vote: Yes - 13, No - 0, Abstention – 0

xvii. Brooklynn asks whether we can come back to this proposal. Justin says that he is curious about aspects of the proposal, but procedurally we may not want to do that. Clara says that we can incorporate feedback to the unit when we issue the funding allocation letter.

b. Cantu Center

i. Erik explains that he will not be voting on this item. He does not have any plan to apply for the position. He has been speaking to Director Abbott about this proposal for about a year, but is not directly associated with the proposal.

ii. Peter explains that he would like to ask some follow up questions regarding the budget and ask for a line item on the budget. Peter says that the need has been demonstrated and he is supportive, however, he needs more information.

iii. Clara asks about the cycle for the CUIP program. Lucy R. responds. Erik explains that last year there was a CGIP, but not this year, but a blog on the Dean of Graduate Studies page reflects that the internship will return next year.

iv. Lucy C. moves that we ask the unit for a specific budget breakdown. Clara responds that she is disappointed that the unit did not submit the program budget which was a
requirement. Erik says that we should think about the proposals coming from an over worked unit with limited resources. Peter says we could ask for the spreadsheet with the totals, the total was given so the number had to come from somewhere.

v. Lucy C. reminds the group that this is one of the proposals that scored highest.

vi. Erik clarifies that the total includes tuition, salary, health care for a graduate student for one year.

vii. Lucy C. says that she is comfortable moving forward to consider the proposal at this time. Brooklynn is also comfortable moving forward.

viii. Ceril would like to take a straw poll related to asking the unit for the itemized budget. Ceril would like to set a precedent now regarding whether follow up questions will be asked.

ix. Lucy C. says that she doesn’t see any conflict with asking questions or not asking questions.

x. Erik suggests that we do the straw poll regarding whether to go to units or not, procedurally. Yes-7, No-3, 1-Abstention. Motion carries. We will ask units questions.

xi. Peter would like to ask: what are the ramifications of asking one year verses three years? What is the benefit to giving $140K up front? Clara agrees that she would like to fund one year. Lucy C. concurs. Lucy C. moves that we earmark this proposal for two years. Max seconds the motion. $93,766 for two years. Peter suggests that at the end, we could add the third year depending on how the funding shakes out at the end of the process.

1. Results of Vote: Yes - 7, No-1, Abstain -3

5. Erik moves to adjourn the meeting; Tony seconds the motion. Motion passes. Meeting adjourned and agenda items tabled to next meeting.