Student Fee Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
October 26, 2015  

Present: Aykezar Adil, Carolyn Chuong, Grace Shefcik, Chandler Moeller, Alma Sifuentes, Whitney DeVos, Free Moini, Lucy Rojas, Jonica Buck, Julie Foster  

Absent: John Steele, David Machuca, Rachel Kirkwood, Serene Jneid, Alice Malmberg, Ben Carson Leeds, Miten Jain  

1. Approval of agenda and minutes  
   a. Tabled due to lack of quorum  

2. Announcements  
   a. Council on Student Fees meeting will be held on November 14th & 15th at UC Berkeley  
   b. Ayke shares that the external committee will be meeting today after the SFAC meeting. Internal committee will be meeting on Fridays at 11:00 am at Hahn Student Services. Ayke explains that at last week’s internal committee, she and Rachel discussed goals for the year. The goal for this quarter will be to do social gatherings outside of the formal committee meetings. For next year, the goal will be to discuss the funding proposal process and the questions that are used. Spring quarter last year, we looked at by-laws, which will probably happen again this year. Chandler reports that the external committee met last week and began discussion on a survey, town hall, brochure, presentations at GSA and SUA.  

3. Funding Proposal Discussion  
   a. Aykezar asks for feedback on the funding proposal exercise.  
      i. Jonica says that the exercise was helpful, given that she entered the year mid-way last year.  
      ii. Carolyn says that the discussion was good. She says that it’s probably difficult to rate proposals on the writing style; it is difficult to understand what the intentions of the programs are sometimes. We can ask people to put in as much effort as possible.  
      iii. Grace says that it was good that we didn’t all agree; this was a good place to start for a mock exercise.  
      iv. Chandler says that as someone who is new, it was helpful, but he doesn’t have anything to compare it to.  
      v. Whitney says it was difficult to balance various factors involved with evaluation.  
   b. Ayke explains that she and David met after the last meeting. She and David want to propose some guidelines to follow while members are reviewing proposals. She asks everyone to give suggestions for edits. The guidelines are:  
      i. Are they answering each question to the best of their ability?  
      ii. Keep in mind quality over quantity. Some proposals may benefit smaller number of students, keep quality in mind.  
      iii. Do they give us a plan for fulfilling the program? Are they telling us what steps they will take once they receive the funding?  
      iv. Are they aware of where the funding is going and what happens if there are shortfalls and we don’t fully fund. Ayke says that last year, proposals were inconsistent on whether they answered the question on funding shortfall.  
      v. Are you keeping your constituency in mind? This is one of the ratings that you have at the very end, what the impact is to constituency?  
      vi. Try your best to remain impartial and remove bias. Lucy adds that the group has a strong history of members disclosing when they are “close” to a proposal, maybe they work at the unit, or in the past we have had authors who were also committee members.
vii. Discussion

1. Whitney is interested in reading the proposals as generously as possible. Need is very crucial right now; so Whitney says that she may not be over critical about writing style.
2. Chandler says that he likes the guidelines.
3. Grace likes that Ayke proposed that quality is as important as quantity. It’s not about the numbers, but about the community that the proposal will affect.
5. Lucy adds that whatever process we agree on should become one of the guidelines.

C. Funding Proposal

i. Lucy explains that 39 proposals have been submitted. She will share a Google folder with members; inside the folder will be each proposal’s materials along a scoring sheet for each member.

ii. Ayke asks for feedback on proposal process. We can take a few meetings off and members will use the time to review and score all of the proposals, or we can continue meeting and plan to read a few proposals each week.

1. Jonica is OK with the hiatus idea.
2. Carolyn says that she liked the way we did it last year, where we took a couple of meetings off and then came back to discuss.
3. Grace says that she like the way that we did it last year, but by the end of the quarter it was difficult to recall why she had rated things in a certain way. Ayke adds that we could add something to the guidelines which would remind members to read proposals before meetings.
4. Julie suggests that we split into two groups.
5. Whitney asks for clarification on how much funding is available. Free responds that it’s approximately $656,000 one time funds.
6. Straw poll result: majority support is for taking a hiatus.
7. Lucy suggests that we can maintain the meeting time and use that time for review of proposals.
8. Outcome: for the next two meetings we will be on hiatus; next meeting will be on Monday, November 16th.

D. Previous funding review

i. Free shares a spreadsheet that summarizes the funding that has been issued in the past. EVC Galloway has approved at additional allocation of $400,000 to SFAC for allocation, for a total of $656,455

ii. The technology and maintenance fund is current in deficit because there were some large maintenance programs that were funded including fire alarm upgrades at OPERS and Kresge elevator

4. Facilities Update – Associate Vice Chancellor/Dean of Students Alma Sifuentes

a. The group conducts introductions.

b. Alma explains that she has been the Dean of Students for about ten years. She leads and participates on a number of campus committees that feed into the current facility projects. Alma is also responsible for managing risk and compliance; both facility projects related to risk and compliance. Health and safety are always critical aspects. Alma explains that she would like to come in at least once per quarter to talk about current topics.

c. Seismic project update:
i. Alma explains that the campus has been behind on seismic and safety projects due to budgetary issues. Office of the President had given the campus an extension to complete the projects. The seismic project is funded by a referendum that is for safety and seismic, specifically. The referendum was sponsored by the Chancellor.

ii. The seismic fund is separate than the SSF, but EVC always wants to have SFAC involved.

iii. Phase I is underway which includes the Student Union, Redwood Building and Cardiff House (Womens’ Center).
   1. Construction status for Cardiff House: project is approximately 70% complete and is scheduled to be complete by late November, with occupancy scheduled for December 2015. What that means is that when we return from winter break the Women’s Center will be back at Cardiff House (January 2016).
   2. Construction status for Student Union and Redwood Building: Project is 45% complete. Construction is scheduled to be complete in June 2016. Occupants will probably move back in summer 2016, in time for fall opening 2016.

iv. Phase II is KZSC and the Cantu Center. Alma explains that this area has ADA accessibility issues. Alma explains that while we are doing this work, we are also addressing updates for ADA and accessibility related needs.

v. Phase I and II had truncated periods of consultation.

d. Quarry Amphitheatre
   i. Alma explains that the Quarry Amphitheatre has never really had a “home” organizationally.
   ii. The Quarry was originally closed after someone fell and hurt themselves.
   iii. Alma explains that the Quarry is difficult to actually “shut down”
   iv. Alma thanks SFAC for allocating $6 million for the Quarry project. The campus was to raise $1.8 million to bring the facility back on line at basic levels – safety, seismic, ADA compliance and accessibility. There has been discussion of a Phase II that would be funding by fundraising and include things like a smart stage, concessions, a multi-purpose room, industrial kitchen.
   v. Alma explains that the campus has been struggling with the fundraising aspect.
   vi. The feasibility study has been completed. Next step is a meeting with the EVC to brief her and discuss next steps. Alma’s recommendation is that we push the project forward, even before all of the money is raised, for a number of reasons, including 1) if we delay, costs go up and 2) we are out of space. We need more space for student organizations. 3) Alma believes the facility has potential for revenue generation.

vii. Questions
   1. Ayke asks how much has been fundraised for the project? Alma responds that $245,000 has been raised (as of September 2015).

e. Alma mentions that she may ask SFAC to appoint a representative to the planning committee.

f. Alma asks for feedback from the group
   i. Chandler remembers this item coming up at his college government last year. What is the timeline? Alma responds ideally, Fall 2017.
   ii. Alma mentions that she may recommend to the EVC that SFAC have naming rights of the facility, especially if we have to come back to SFAC to ask for more funding for the project.
   iii. Grace says that last year when we talked about this, her Senate didn’t feel it was a good use of funding. She was conflicted personally, because she saw potential in the project. She sees a lot of ways that the space can be used. Grace is happy about how the seismic projects are progressing.
   iv. Carolyn says that her college is supportive of Quarry project.
v. Ayke shares that her college is excited about the project. She is happy to see that the seismic project is on schedule.

vi. Jonica says that Oakes’ main concern is that with a high number of students of color, there was concern about the temporary location for tenants of the Student Union and Redwood Building. The current location is good.

vii. Whitney says that graduate students are generally supportive of phase I of Quarry, and skeptical of student fees being used for the project. Graduate students are skeptical of Phase II, especially around bringing outside groups to the Quarry given issues with parking, event planning, etc.

viii. Julie says that she likes Phase I, and does not like Phase II

ix. Alma completes her comments and exits the meeting

x. Any comments on Alma’s presentation?
   1. Whitney asks for clarification on the funding for the Quarry project? Ayke summarizes our work last year. The thinking of the group last year was that if SFAC recommended to allocate the funds because it would help fundraise.
   2. Lucy sends the letter that SFAC issued last year re: recommendation on the Quarry project.

5. Adjournment – meeting adjourned at 10:45am