1. Approval of Agenda, Minutes and Announcements
   a. Miten makes a motion to approve the agenda. Alice seconds the motion. Motion carries.
   b. Vote on agenda and minutes is tabled to next meeting.
   c. Announcements
      i. Today, Wednesday and Friday. 10 – 1pm. SUA Office of Academic Affairs will be tabling outside of S&E and McHenry Libraries with coffee, donuts and testing supplies.
   d. Request from Student Committee on Committees
      i. Aykezar explains that the SCOC has submitted a request to submit a proposal to SFAC for money to back fill a deficit that they started the year with, about $2500. The deficit is resulting in office
      ii. Grace asks how the year ended in deficit.
      iii. Miten says that if we open up the proposal process, we should open up to other groups such as the GSA who is in need of funding proposals.
      iv. Various members post questions and discussion. Alice expresses concern regarding setting a precedent to open up the funding call process, after we are
      v. Aykezar asks whether there is a motion. Jonica makes a motion to not open up the funding call process. Alice seconds the motion. Result of Vote: Yes – 7; No-0; Absention-2.
   e. SAGE feedback
      i. Alice reports that many senates did not meet last week because of the Thanksgiving holiday.
      ii. Aykezar says that she spoke at her Senate and her constituency would like greater transparency and discussion around the issue.
      iii. Jonica reports that her Senate discussed and they would like more information.
      iv. Rachel reports that she received some feedback over email. There is concern that we are going to students to ask for feedback without a concrete plan and concrete numbers. Rachel says that she also feels uncomfortable in soliciting feedback or gathering information without a lot of details.
   f. Winter Quarter meeting day and time
      i. David shares that the outcome of the scheduling exercise resulted in two possible meeting times: Friday, 12:30 – 2:00pm or Friday, 1:00 – 2:30pm.
      ii. At each of these times, we would love 2-3 people.
      iii. Ayke, David, and Lucy will get together to discuss and make a decision by the end of the day.

2. Funding Proposal Discussion
   a. TAPS Disability Van Services & Nigh Shuttle/UCPD Saferide. Request is for $6,297.00
      i. Straw poll on whether the group wants to discuss this proposal. Majority thumbs up. Ayke asks for discussion.
      ii. Alice explains that she attended one of the focus groups on TAPS and the service seems like it is important.
      iii. David expresses concern whether a public telephone would be available, given that cell reception is not consistent around campus.
iv. Clarification that the program will have student drivers.

v. Miten says that he is supportive of this proposal; he is supportive of the app.

vi. John clarifies that adding wireless hot spots on campus is very challenging. It’s a great idea, but we should think realistically about the feasibility of implementation.

vii. Miten suggests that the request system could be online, so someone could request a ride from a computer in a lab, for instance.

viii. Ayke says that this is pilot program and up in the air. She trusts TAPS, and that TAPS wants to keep students safe. Not all students will have cell phone/cell phone app access. She would trust TAPS to figure out alternative for students who do not have cell phone access.

ix. Alice says that TAPS reported that this program was piloted at Davis where it has been very popular.

x. Miten motions to approve the fully funding, with caveat that they TAPS further investigate improving cell phone coverage and/or wi-fi. Jonica seconds the motion.

1. Discussion: Jonica asks how would we know that TAPS addresses the caveats? Ayke says that she would keep in touch with TAPS.

2. Chandler asks whether Miten’s comment was a suggestion or condition? Miten says it’s a suggestion.

3. Ayke says that she would add in a suggestion to identify other methods for students to be able to request a ride, such as a public phone that is accessible.

4. Alice suggests that there could be a computer in the library identified for use to make request for a ride.

5. Miten makes an amendment to his motion: add stipulation that the library should have some kind of tablet, phone, etc. where a request for a ride could be made. Lucy adds the suggestion that each circulation desk has a land line phone that can be used for inter-campus phone calls.

6. Alice asks if we can suggest that at midnight, when the libraries close, and there are more riders that a nite-owl shuttle be added.

7. David says that this is a pilot program, and we may be adding too many ideas. If we are supportive of this pilot program, we could simply support and see what happens and how successful it is. Ayke agrees and says that we put our trust in TAPS to implement the program.

8. Vote: 8-Yes. 0-No. 1-Absention. Outcome: Fully fund at $6,297.00

b. EOP Program

i. Proposal is for $72,000 for Textbook Lending Library to fund for three years.

ii. Miten says that this proposal had a good score for him and the proposal was well written. This proposal sounds like a good idea, however, in this example, he is wondering if this is a service that student fees should pay for or should there be institutional support that comes from campus?

1. John responds that this comes up a lot in this committee. Should certain expenses be paid for from core funding? Free responds that this discussion is ongoing in multiple spaces. Free says that per policy, this kind of expenditure would be allowed on SSF. It is a valid question; is the program important enough to against a principle of having core funding pay for services (such as the lending library).

2. David says that it comes down to how many programs a unit can offer, and what the quality of the programs will be if they don’t have funding. This is how he looks at the
question. If we have the funding and it’s available – should it not go to programs that can help students?

3. Rachel says that this is an issue that continuously comes up. This proposal is for three years. For students who are here now, the funding can help students with moving them toward graduation.

iii. Ayke is supportive of a program that will help students do better in school, stress less about school and how to get their books.

iv. Chandler suggests that we consider funding for two years, and make an earmark, then come back at the end of process to see if we have any more funds available.

v. Miten suggests an amendment to the motion, $48,000 would cover two years. Miten would rather give $57,000 for minimum operating capacity.

vi. Aykezar says that there is no formal motion, item will be tabled to our next meeting.

3. Mental Health – Presentation by Dr. Mary Knudtson and Dr. Gary Dunn

a. The group completes introductions.

b. Gary thanks the group for their time.

c. Gary provides back ground information on how this issue evolved. Last year, there was a major shooting incident in Isla Vista, outside of UC Santa Barbara. At that time, some of the UCs were experiencing long wait times to see a counselor. There were student protests, President Napolitano became interested/involved. At this time, system-wide discussion began regarding counselor to student ratios, and comparing those rates to other schools such as private schools.

i. Current recommended ratios by the group that we are accredited through: 1 counselor to every 1000 to 1 counselor to every 1500 students.

ii. There was a study conducted by UCOP where each campus completed an assessment of the current ratios, and costs involved with an optimal model. OP also asked for summary of critical needs for current and anticipated situation.

d. Gary explains that throughout this process, CAPS has consulted with its student advisory board and other student groups around campus.

e. Gary explains that our plan addresses that funds will phase in over five years.

f. What was eventually agreed upon between the Regents, Governor and UCOP was a 5% SSF increase for the next five years. This equals about $48 per student in year one, and then doubled in the second year, and so on. The resulting fees would be split via a 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 model=1/3 CAPS, 1/3 Return to Aid, 1/3 other campus needs. Therefore in year one, CAPS would see $16 per student increase toward mental health services.

g. Several priorities for this funding:

i. Ongoing work with alcohol and other drugs and supporting work that is being done on the recovery community. SFAC funded a post doc position for one year. SSF increase will be used to permanently fund that position.

ii. Counselor with specialization in working with African American students.

iii. Additional case manager to address psychiatric issues and hospitalizations.

iv. Counselor with multi-cultural focused skills.

v. Generalist position

vi. Position focused on trauma and sexual trauma, to support work in the CARE program.

vii. In psychiatry, there are three positions that have been fully funded or partially funded by funds that are generated by the student health center. This would be considered soft money. We are concerned about funding these positions out of excess revenue that may or
may not be generated in the health center. Need to put these positions on permanent funding, to maintain no out of pockets costs for students for psychiatry.

h. Gary explains that UCOP has recognized that we will not be able to fund all of these positions in year one. The problem is happening now; UCOP is expecting each campus to take temporary measures to address current, critical needs.

i. Mary adds that one of the highest priorities is to reduce wait times for students. She adds that psychiatry has been funded through carry forward, which are not permanent, and those funds are running out. We need to maintain psychiatry on campus because resources are extremely limited in the Santa Cruz community. We are looking to address the most pressing needs. Mary adds that the goal is to fill all of the new positions by the end of year one. Permanent space on campus for additional staff is also a challenge.

j. Gary says that the funds that were allocated from the SSF fee increase came with very specific restrictions – which is direct, therapeutic services in “Tier 1” types of services. There is little discretion on how these funds are to be used.

k. Mary says that there are options for online therapy and tele-therapy that will be piloted to see if this model works for students. We will use this in year one while the new positions are filled.

l. Mary says that the resulting increase will be 7.4 new positions

m. Free reviews a planning assumptions worksheet which outlines how the funding will be spent.

n. David asks whether the positions are paid the same at all of the campuses? Mary responds no, our campus tends to be one of the lowest paid campuses.

o. Jonica asks about usage rates for CAPS and Psychiatry. Gary responds that approximately 2,000 students utilized CAPS services last year. Gary estimates that Psychiatry served about 500 students. Mary adds that utilization has increased. Many students have Medical or Kaiser, so they cannot see a psychiatrist in the local area.

p. Grace asks if there is a current position or plan for a position that focuses on gender identity and sexuality. Mary responds that about 1/3 of the staff are interested in this area and all staff are competent, but there is no one staff member who specializes. Several staff members have a special interest and have been able to help students with this issue – both in psychiatry and CAPS. Gary adds that the current multi-cultural focused counselor is the liaison to the Cantu Center, and there are two current groups that focus on Queer and Questioning students. Mary adds that we are one of the only campuses that does administer hormone treatments for transitioning students; Gary mentions that students who are transitioning are referred to off campus therapist for more long term therapy. Gary adds that the new trauma focused position could have a specialty in this area.

q. Brief discussion about student satisfaction survey that was recently issued.

r. Discussion regarding need for trauma specific counselor.

s. Rachel asks about the budget – is it confidential? Gary responds that it is in draft form. Gary says that it’s fine to discuss with constituents; please be clear that it is a draft. Deadline for submission of plan to UCOP is December 4, 2015.

t. Discussion following presentation:
   i. David concerned regarding hiring people without specific focus areas.
   ii. Counselor who focuses on AA should attend BSU meetings.

4. Other items
   a. Chandler asks whether the results of the SFAC survey are confidential? Response is no.

5. Adjournment – meeting adjourned at 10:50.
   a. Chandler motions to adjourn the meeting; Jonica seconds the motion. Motion carries.