Student Fee Advisory Committee
April 21, 2023
Meeting Minutes

Present: Jun Jang, Johnathan Li, Kasey Ning, Shruti Gundu, Reginald Gardner, Lee Bardwell, Joshua Ma, Taeoni Norgaar, Angela Yun, Darlene Esparza, Sharad Mehrotra, Francesca Fong

Absent: Sarah Semaan, Parleen Brar

Committee Staff: Karen Mizumoto and Jonathan Saucedo

1) 4/14/23 minutes approved.
    a) Jun asked members to review the present/absent members listed in the minutes because this serves as the record for attendance.

2) Discussion on Johnathan's Proposals To Distribute Remaining Funds
    a) Proposal 1 – $34K for DCA Photo Booth; remaining split based on %
        i) Reginald believes the photo booth is useful; however, it would require a lot of upkeep, and the cost would be much better suited for a student photographer instead.
        ii) Committee vote 0-7-0 to not fund DCP photobooth request.
    b) Proposal 2 – $75K split based on % not based on prioritizing student positions or programming.
    c) Proposal 3 – Prioritizing student positions and then split remaining to fund programming.
        i) Reginald felt prioritizing student staff based on what he has heard across campus and across the UC about the declining hiring of graduate students, prioritizing student staff positions is more important particularly in tutoring and health care spaces and peer-to-peer advising positions.
    d) Proposal 4 – Prioritizing programming and then split remaining to fund student positions.
    e) Darlene had a question about the ranking process and if the recommended requests in green included both staffing and programming. Jun confirmed that the recommended requests in green include both staffing and programming. These were the requests that had the highest average rankings during the initial first round of rankings and the committee classified these as "definitely" fundable and the committee would recommend these request for funding. The "maybe" categorized requests would be revisited if there was funding left. The remaining requests in red were requests the committee did not find were within the scope of the committee or as compelling as the other requests. After the initial review and the recommendations to fund the "definitely" fundable requests, there was ~$75k remaining and the committee discussed how the remaining amount would be distributed among the "maybe" requests.
    f) Committee voted to prioritize student positions (proposal 4).
        i) Committee vote: Fund all equally = 3; Prioritize programming = 0; Prioritize student staff = 9.

3) Discussion on Second Round – Funding for Maybe Fundable Proposals
    a) Requests for student staff positions include the MCSB program in the School of Biological Sciences; School of Engineering; Merage School of Business; and OVPTL.
    b) Student position requests of $81k exceed remaining balance of $75k

c) The committee discussed adjusting specific student position requests in the "maybe" category to fit into the $75k available.
d) The committee also discussed revisiting the recommended requests to possibly reduce some of these requests to bridge the $6k gap between the $81,276 and the $75,716.
e) Reginald recommended removing some of the smaller allocations under $1,000.
f) Most of the student position requests are almost fully funded.
g) Darlene shared that most units that submitted programming related requests would want any percentage of funding they can get.
h) Karen advised the committee that they can request a small amount of money from the Provost to round out the requests.
i) The committee discussed funding whole positions/clean amounts as much as possible or providing an amount determined by the committee and let the unit decide how to utilize their funding for student staff positions (for instance if the unit decides to adjust the number of hours for student staff rather than the number of positions).
j) For OVPTL LARC tutors the committee recommended funding $20k.
k) SRC requested $7,500 for three positions and $6,620 for a fourth position. The committee proposed rounding down the recommendation to $20k.
l) School of Engineering requested funding for 2-4 retention coaches. The committee recommended providing $18k in funding.
m) The Merage School of Business requested $9,300 in funding for six peer coaches. The committee recommended funding $9,300.
n) The committee recommended funding $3,212 for the MCSB peer tutors.
o) For programming requests, the committee recommended partial funding of $2,500 for the Cross Cultural Center, $1,300 for Campus Orgs & Volunteer Programs, and $1,400 for the SRC.
p) The committee zeroed out the Campus Recreation request due to the small % of their total request that would be funded (about 6^% of the $21k).
q) Committee voted to approve the final funding recommendations.

4) Annual Report
   a) Jun and Johnathan will work on drafting the SFAC's annual report, including the final funding recommendations, for the committee to review at the 5/5/23 meeting (next week's meeting on 4/28 will be cancelled).

5) Other Business
   a) Jun will send out information for chair and vice chair elections; elections will probably be in a few weeks after the annual report is completed.
   b) Jun will send out a form to the graduating members for graduation stoles and to all committee members for sweatshirts.
   c) Recruitment for new members for next year
       i)   The incoming chair should determine when the recruitment of new members should begin (this spring or next fall).
       ii) A two-tier approach might be helpful. Start recruiting in spring for continuing students who have more knowledge about the programs and activities going on campus, but fall is also beneficial because of new and transfer students have various levels of experience and knowledge from their previous institutions that would be helpful for serving on the committee.

       iii) There will be at least one open seat due to graduation and three student representatives are up for renewal.

6) Meeting adjourned.