

**Student Fee Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Winter Quarter Week 9, 3/6/2020
PC West Warren College Room
2:00-4:00PM**

- I. Call to order
-- 2:04 PM
- II. Roll call
PRESENT: GSA Representatives, AS Shadow, AS Representative, Muir Shadow, Sixth Representative, Marshall Shadow, Marshall Representative, Council of Provosts, CBO Louie Cruz, Revelle Representative, Roosevelt College, Vice Chair, Chair, Graduate Division, VCSA Budget Consultants
ABSENT:
- III. Motion to approve Week 7's Minutes & last week's minutes
-- Motion: Revelle Representative; Second: Marshall Representative
- IV. Proposal Discussion
 - A. Analysis of final scoring
 1. Council of Provosts: Is there a sense of how far each proposal is from each other?
 2. Vice Chair: I think the proposals in 2nd, 3rd, and 4th place need to be addressed because they're only 1 point apart in importance. We should decide where we want to group initiatives now that we've seen how close the results are.
 3. GSA Representative: It might be worth normalizing it to each person's ratings.
 4. Hughes: There's nothing in the scores that demonstrate a strong preference between 2-6. We cared a lot about undocumented students, here's our feedback on the proposals but there's not that much distinction between them. It'll allow the administration to look at the cases in 2-6 and make the decision.
 5. GSA Representative: I wasn't here last year, but I heard that it was easier having level cutters. Would it be better to suggest that people submit smaller proposals? We'd probably like them to cut proposals compared to us doing so.
 6. Vice Chair: It just makes the decision-making process easier. The scoring isn't the be-all end-all. If we all think 2-6 are about equal, then it's fine if they're the same. There's not a benefit to separating the proposals.
 7. Hughes: We don't have a large number or large proposals (\$300k+), usually they'll ask for FTEs. My guess is that we had about the same level cutters last year. Perhaps that's a suggestion we can offer.
 8. GSA Representative: If there's an entity within 2-6 that, if chosen, would make people dissatisfied, what would that be? If there's no consensus on something being worse, then it's fine.
 9. Revelle Representative: Did the person's scoring that was deleted similar to the committee's 2-6? It might skew the data a lot or equalize it a lot more.

10. Hughes: At the end of the day, what's most important is why. Why did the committee favor certain proposals over others and why would one benefit the student experience more so than the others?

11. AS Representative: The committee should discuss how the care for the first proposal means a lot. It's more than a number on a page. It should be in the context of how the landscape was skewed because the first proposal was so mandatory. The middle section is still very important, and not half-and-half on.

12. Revelle Representative: I especially liked the mentor program because there's a large push for mental health awareness at the lower level (freshmen). With programs that demonstrate unique students and numerical increase, it's a good way of creating a student-centric environment.

13. Cruz: The coordinator FTE is important because peer counseling is going to grow to various groups. Having this backbone to support the process will help with guidelines and consistency.

14. Hughes: Has anyone utilized success coaches or peer mentoring programs? Was having a coach in regards to academics still helpful on one's mental health simply because they have someone to talk to? If that's true, then it would be an amazing investment.

15. Chair: I think we should mention that in the report. It's about having a friend on campus that can relate to one's experiences. Discussing why that's beneficial to students can explain more in-depth why the service is valuable.

16. Provosts: I think there's a large population of international students with unique needs so it's our responsibility as a campus to assist them in their special requirements.

17. GSA Representative: It also provides knowledge of resources to international students.

18. Provosts: It's a package of services.

19. Vice Chair: I don't think there's a significant difference between SRS and Undocumented.

20. VCSA Budget Consultant: We can mention believing that legal services and other areas are more important than others.

21. Chair: We were pretty surprised about how low TritonFest was ranked this year since traditionally they're been helpful with gathering students on an evening.

22. AS Representative: A lot of it is a comparative issue. It doesn't meet the same criteria as Undocumented which is critical and must be funded.

23. Provosts: I was surprised that TritonFest was ranked highly since larger and less events compared to smaller and more events.

24. Vice Chair: Event fatigue happens because everyone wants events to be catered to their needs. I don't think that there isn't a demand for events, it's that students want more events catered to their needs. The message of wanting less events is generally incorrect.

25. AS Representative: It's not about having less events, it's about having higher

quality events.

26. Hughes: What makes an event have quality? Is it a name brand act?

27. AS Representative: For me, it needs to feel like you've transformed something on campus. The night market on library walk is a quality event because it transforms that area to a different feel. Physically, it changes the environment and is emotionally exciting.

28. Roosevelt College: I think it's also important to have notable speakers. To have the ability to attract amazing talent that boosts the prestige of the campus. It helps with getting a wider audience.

29. GSA Representative: All of the organizations requesting should do a better job of gathering data to see how many unique students are swiping in. If you want to serve the needs of the students better, you need to know the students you're serving.

30. Revelle Representative: UEO really hammered in that it was a small office while doing a lot of work. It seemed like a direct way that UCSD was creating an experience for students through connecting with them.

31. Vice Chair: There's a lot of different desires on campus for events. I'm supportive of UEO because it'll result in a large step back. If it doesn't receive support from the administration, it'll be a large negative. We'll lose capabilities in the area we're trying to approve in-- not being UC Socially Dead.

32. Chair: The fact that we have two different opinions of what a quality event is but also agree that TritonFest is a quality event shows that we should fund it.

33. Roosevelt Representative: The reason why I ranked the Event Specialist low is because the methodology of how they will collect data is critical. It's a high cost.

34. Provosts: TritonFest is to establish permanent ties.

35. GSA Representative: Is there a reason why student organizations aren't empowered more versus making permanent positions?

36. Vice Chair: I think there's a difference in quality. They have people that are professionals and don't have other obligations, which is why TritonFest works out well.

37. Roosevelt Representative: It's because it's a pilot program, there's no concrete evidence that it is as substantial as programs with history. I would like to receive more from the Graduate Division on concerns the council has. I

38. Revelle Representative: I think the GPSES report was very important. I like the program but I wanted to see more of an emphasis on how they were getting students out of their labs and towards the Career Center. How will they tackle the number of students that have never heard of the Career Center?

39. Chair: It points out a bigger issue for the Career Center to market out their services better. Will it ultimately help the students?

40. Revelle Representative: If funding these four people relieves pressure from an FTE who can then market towards under-reached departments, then I'd like to see that in the presentation.

41. Vice Chair: The reason why I didn't think this proposal was as valuable is because there is nothing lost. If we keep services the way they are, there's no statistics on non-use requiring more resources to utilize the peer educator.
42. Hughes: This is a request for a one-time funding that, if successful, will be funded internally?
43. Roosevelt Representative: Graduate students don't receive as much resources compared to undergraduates. That's the reason why I ranked it higher.
44. GSA Representative: If the employment conditions change than resources might be more necessary towards assisting in careers.
45. Provosts: There was data about how the graduate population increased versus employment at the Career Center. I wasn't sure that this was the right program for the issue.
46. Grad Division: The growth in the graduate population has been substantial in the last few years. The services at the Career Center have not gone up. I think they can do a ton better. The Peer Educators could do their own outreach. We want SFAC to fund the pilot, it's successful, and then the department can fund it. If it's successful, then everyone wins.
47. AS Representative: I don't think that the committee should consider funding the same programs only and in a situation like this, there can be added value to the campus to see if it works.
48. Roosevelt Representative: They noted that the Program Manager was the most important for them.
49. Chair: In the report, I will mention that we split the proposal because we felt that the Program Manager would free up a lot more need on ArtPower's other requests. Is there any reasoning that it's low other than "other proposals are more important"?
50. Vice Chair: It's not an important activity compared to Undocumented Students. It's merely a suggestion. There are some considerations on conditions that hinder their ability to provide.
51. Provosts: It's not that different compared to the other proposals placed in the 2nd bin. It does something different than TritonFest. I think it's important to support the arts. We can lump it with TritonFest to show that SFAC is in support of ways that students can enjoy themselves on campus.
52. GSA Representative: If there's only 3,000 students attending per year, it's a lot of money per student compared to TritonFest. I have issues with ArtPower because it doesn't seem that it's aimed towards students. There's no funding given towards transportation to get students towards events.
53. Hughes: Is there any support for general production support?
54. Vice Chair: It's better to fund the event compared to funding the person in charge of the event.
55. Vice Chair: The reason why the event specialist was not funded because there was no negative consequences on TritonFest and no added benefits other than giving a gift to the office.

56. Revelle Representative: We didn't like \$75,000 coming from students for Mandeville renovations that were botched and now students have to pay for off-campus transportation now.
57. GSA Representative: If they're needing to hold everything off-campus, that's just where student funds are going.
58. AS Representative: We should say whether we feel there is value in the initiative. Thus, they can get funding that can create better events that make students find greater value.
59. Vice Chair: Comparatively, it did not rank well but I think that there's still value in the proposals. Comparatively, it is not very valuable.
60. Revelle Representative: Theoretically, we should be representative of everyone. But they're not in reality. I think ArtPower is a good program at its core.
61. Vice Chair: Why should we split the two?
62. Provosts: When ArtPower came in, it seemed that the Production Manager was essential to their shows. That's why I was in favor of keeping it separate.
63. Muir Representative: I rated the ArtPower manager higher and there's a bigger difference between the two halves for me. It can theoretically open up other resources that can cover their second half. There's at least one proposal between the two so this way it can be more accurate towards where priorities stand. It allows us to specify more.
64. AS Representative: I like this one because it's an administrative thing that we can actually use. I'm curious why some people dislike this program.
65. Vice Chair: I gave it a 54. I don't think there's an issue with revealing your scores. The depth is very small. It's a small impact. It's an enrollment hold that will happen to a small number of students. They'll still process it and just slower.
66. Revelle Representative: I rated it below 50. The presentation didn't have a lot of data to support their claims. Their argument on what the person will do in the off-season was lackluster. We felt that it could be filled by a part-time seasonal trained undergraduate instead.
67. Hughes: Anyone can have any job and if it requires confidentiality, then that just has to be respected.
68. Hughes: I suggest that alternatives towards meeting the needs should be included. We should mention that they didn't demonstrate a financial need even though they presented a demand.
69. Revelle Representative: They didn't demonstrate the official capacity of the program. If it's just students hosting random dialogues without specific administrative outreach, then it doesn't feel like the program is actual work opposed to volunteering.
70. Vice Chair: The depth is just too low because it doesn't affect that many people and doesn't affect them to a significant degree.

STRAW POLL:

Q: Should we combine the two categories for ArtPower or keep them separate?

A: Yes, split: 9

No, keep it together: 1

B. Wordsmithing draft of report

V. Announcements

VI. Adjournment

-- 3:57 PM