

SFAC Spring Meeting #2
4/6/15 8:00AM-10:00AM
Student Services Center 400

Call to Order

Present: Paul Tchir, Jackie Markt-Maloney, Prasad Radhakrishna, Mihiri Ukuwela, Andrew Thai, Ashraf Ramzy Beshay, Darlene Nguyen, Jennifer Huerta, Ivan Evans, William McCarroll, John Hughes

Absent: Ellen Kim, Mukanth Vaidyanathan, Norienne Saign, Sylvia Lepe-Askari

Discussion of Budget Recommendations

1. Paul updated key areas that included emergency awareness, Programs Abroad, email accessibility, and visibility/transparency
2. Regarding ICA, how do we want to approach it? Do we want to tackle it head-on, or do we want to take a more passive approach towards it? We want to address it, but we need to decide on how we do so
 - a. Avoid redirecting ICA funds towards another source, but we can make a comment about redirecting SSF funds towards a new directive
 - b. What do we ultimately want? Starts off that UCSD Recreation is a positive thing, but towards the end we say that we want less of a focus on sports facilities. So what's our end goal?
 - c. In the end, we can wordsmith this as much as we want, but the impact of it may not have its full effect.
 - d. "ICA was valued by students, but not necessarily a top priority"
3. FTE's
 - a. There is communication and the idea that there is support for new FTE's
 - b. Reword it such that we value initiatives that support students directly because we don't know each individual case – more sense to focus on what's important to us
 - i. See a focus on student fee-funded FTE's and the amount of programming services that directly impact and provide for students
4. Approval of Winter Quarter Recommendations – 11-0-0

Priorities for the rest of the year: Student Legal Services, Food Pantry, ICA/Recreation/Sports Facilities

1. Begin on a smaller scale – investigate issues that we've already discussed, and expand that in Fall quarter with the idea of setting up a town hall, figuring out what concerns are to determine what units they'll look at
2. These three items are the ones that might benefit the committee more, and knowing more information might better our opinions about them
3. Student Legal Services
 - a. Sit down and discuss how we can help them and use student services fee
4. Food Pantry

- a. Issue of the pantry not have sustainable funds
 - b. It's premature - they'll have very little information to share with us because they had just got off the launch pad.
5. ICA
- a. Clarifying ICA recreation sports facilities, what sorts of funds they receive, how they use them, etc.
 - b. Only 5% of their budget is student services fee; stay focused on our goal/objective
6. Other areas that we want to delve into
- a. Student safety – interest in starting a workgroup with a undergrad and graduate student from SFAC as a focus to improve the process by which students can report - for example, maintenance for lighting
 - i. Huge concern for lighting on campus – the campus in general is under-lit
 - ii. The idea of looking at new initiatives – innovative perspective towards something that we want to look at
 - b. Safety in general
 - i. Emergency plans in case of any events, general alertness on campus
 - ii. Challenges with safety plans, such as active shooter preparation, is that the student body tends to turn over
 - 1. The ideal of being regularly prepared for the most likely incident is difficult to achieve
 - iii. Emergency operations center – haven't had a scenario in two years, but usually a scenario is staged with simulated casualties and the local police/fire departments are involved
 - iv. Focus not only reactionary procedures, but also preventative procedures. There is a developing culture within our communities that is evolving to be discriminatory – who can we serve, who do we interact with, who does what.
 - 1. Engage in conversations that encourage our students to be more aware – as simple as advocating more inclusive language
 - 2. Creating a more inclusive campus in efforts of trying to prevent these situations from happening
7. So what do we want to look further in? Student Legal Services, Food Pantry, ICA, and Safety/Inclusion

Membership and Bylaw Changes

1. SFAC charter membership regarding attendance and appointments – standardizing it throughout colleges
 - a. Have the member appointed in Spring, shadows in the Fall
2. Councils value the authority of being able to appoint their members – but SFAC can possibly provide additional questions during the interview
 - a. Or have SFAC choose from a decided pool of final candidates
 - b. Or have SFAC choose their own representatives to attract students who are interested in finance rather than college councils
 - c. Or have SFAC be able to reject a candidate
3. Process before principle – What do we want from our committee membership?

- a. Some danger in being self-selecting – possibility of ending up with a homogenous board
- 4. Suggestion of having someone from SFAC sit on their interview committee so that we have a more active role towards the process
- 5. Lack of accountability and transparency during these election committees
- 6. Attract more students for SFAC through our own campaigns to publicize what SFAC does
- 7. If we did reject applicants, it would be better to propose a two part interview process – go through the college council, then interview with SFAC.
 - a. It's more engaging, and not punitive
- 8. Two year terms
 - a. Reform the shadow program to be more of an alternates program to have two people of the same level of experience
 - b. Two years is preferable because you get a better understanding of the process
 - c. One year is more realistic – can potentially encourage more people to get involved
 - d. Straw poll - Option 1 - supporting members being appointed of the Spring, Option 2 - supporting members being appointed in the Fall | 9-0-1
 - e. Straw poll - Option 1 - one year term Option 2 - two year term | 0-10-0
 - f. Straw poll - Option 1 - support term limits for student members Option 2 - support no term limits for student members | 2-7-0
 - g. Straw poll - Option 1 - SFAC provides additional questions to be asked during the interview Option 2 - allow SFAC to make final selection regarding candidates Option 3 - confirmation process Option 4 - two round interview process | 8-1-1-8
- 9. Membership and proportionality
 - a. Concerns regarding our representation, more specifically our off campus population – suggestion of adding at-large members
 - b. Will this be a structural change of the committee? Something more permanent rather than a year-to-year basis
 - c. Likewise, having specific meetings to include representatives of these different communities that are affected by student fee-funded units rather than having specific positions for all of these different resources
 - d. Or, have college councils overlap these positions with their representatives or have different focuses regarding membership each year
- 10. Attendance
 - a. Language regarding what was excusable and inexcusable
 - b. Absences dealt with on an appeal process for absences and have two thirds support from the committee
 - c. Functionally sound language – consider what the language is and interpret what authorities are intended
 - i. The idea is that the chair exercised the authority, and if abused, the committee can overrule it

Adjournment

Present: Paul Tchir, Jackie Markt-Maloney, Prasad Radhakrishna, Mihiri Ukuwela, Andrew Thai, Darlene Nguyen, Mukanth Vaidyanathan, Jennifer Huerta, Ivan Evans, William McCarroll, John Hughes

Absent: Ellen Kim, Ashraf Ramzy Beshay, Akshay Tangutur, Norienne Saign, Sylvia Lepe-Askari