

## Student Fee Advisory Committee

February 27, 2015

Meeting Minutes

Present: Sonali Madireddi, Sherwynn Umali, Myron Lozano, John Delshadi, Sanaa Khan, Isaac Straley, Sara Lone, Matthew Tsai, Alexander Le, Ami Glazer, Felicia Martinez

Absent: Justin Chung, Reza Zomorrodian

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

1. Subcommittees met to continue ranking request.
2. Meeting called to order.
3. February 27, 2015 meeting agenda approved.
4. February 20, 2015 meeting minutes approved.
5. Unit Request Reviews
  - a. Student Life
    - i. Medical Education: Support is requested to increase awareness, but no information on what the plan was, who was going to benefit, topics covered.
    - ii. CARE: Not clear what the money for annual supplies will go for.
    - iii. Campus Recreation: Included a very large request to stabilize programs. What is the value of this? What is the impact?
    - iv. AGS: Request for professional development program. Where are the funds going? What is the breakdown between speakers, advertising and marketing?
    - v. Many requests were for a good number of staff. It would be better to support funding for student positions rather than staff positions; the committee should encourage units to hire students, increase student opportunities in staff positions.
  - b. Career & Nonacademic Advising/Academic Advising
    - i. Merage: A large number of requests, which seem non-essential.
    - ii. Career Center: Requested support for career counselor for nonbusiness/non-STEM students. There is an important need to place non-STEM students in jobs.
    - iii. Read & Write Program: The program is a resource to all of the campus; important resource for disabled students.
    - iv. SOAR: Request to make front desk full time; however, the program funding for students is \$10,000 and \$1,000 for retention. Why not ask for more money for programming rather than staff (who could be staffed by students)?
    - v. AGS: Graduate student symposium seems successful; would like to continue.

- c. Wellness & Health
  - i. General comment on full-time staff requests: the need for staff not entirely justified; financial amounts seem unreasonable (2-3x as much would cost for student staff).
  - ii. Campus Recreation: Are they requesting the same funds to support programs that are supported by the ARC fee?
- d. Campus Life
  - i. Highest priorities seem to be mostly for staff in SL&L (LBGTRC, Disabled Students Center, Veterans Services).
  - ii. Some other requests didn't seem to be high priorities (International Student Career Counselor for the Career Center).
  - iii. CARE: Need clarification on what the CARE is asking for/what funds will be used for (same question that Student Life had).
  - iv. SOAR: will receive quite a large source of funding beginning next year (fall 2015); requests are not high priorities.
  - v. New Narratives: Funding requests for other units are higher priorities.
  - vi. Childcare Services: Request for security cameras, additional entrances not within SFAC's purview; maybe Childcare Services can make a small cap project request.
- e. Subcommittees will email their questions to Karen, with a cc: to Sonali, to forward to unit contacts for follow up.

## 6. CSF Update

- a. Campaign status for three campaigns
  - i. Data acquisition
  - ii. Funding streams
  - iii. Campus referendum
    - 1. CSF came out with Standing Policy #8.
    - 2. There will be a student review requirement and detail on what the requirements will be for all referenda going forward.
    - 3. An oversight committee should be established on each campus with representative from each of the fee boards, SFAC and student government to make sure the fee funds are being used as intended. John & Sonali will be working on this for UCI.
- b. Campus updates
  - i. UCSD and UCM have some restrictions on SFAC allocations this year.
    - 1. UCM will be allocating all incremental revenue to SMH. The UCM SFAC was just notified of this by the campus last week.
    - 2. UCSD uses a budgetary authority model. The SFAC reviews requests made to Student Affairs and provides recommendations, but has no authority over the allocation of SSF funds.
  - ii. UCLA focusing on having fewer referendums. Also considering reallocating space for dance groups.

## 7. Meeting adjourned.