Call to Order

Present: Paul Tchir, Jackie Markt-Maloney, Mihiri Ukuwela, Ellen Kim, Andrew Thai, Ashraf Ramzy Beshay, Darlene Nguyen, Akshay Tangutur, Mukanth Vaidyanathan, Norienne Saign, William McCarroll, John Hughes

Absent: Prasad Radhakrishna, Jennifer Huerta, Ivan Evans, Sylvia Lepe-Askari

Dyad Updates

1. SLS
   a. Completed report, will be sent out after the meeting

2. Sports Facilities
   a. Met with Recreation/Sports Facilities, clear picture of what will be produced
   b. Meeting with ICA soon

3. Safety
   a. Meeting with Roberto and Nancy from the Police department and SARC/CARE
   b. Talked about lighting issue – history with why we have such poor lighting
      i. Agreement in the past with the research facility from Palomar regarding less light pollution
   c. Looking forward to continue working with SFAC, prepared to create a presentation for SFAC in the Fall
   d. Resolution is switching over to LED, motion-sensing lights
   e. Looking into potential costs - because of the union, prices are costly, looking for an outside contractor, also regulations have made it difficult to continue in the process
   f. Will take a few years to be successful/show results

4. Food Insecurity
   a. Make it clear to the VCSA that we support funding for the Food Pantry
   b. Current funding options are related to student college councils
   c. Draft a report about options being explored
   d. Already running out of food for certain days, shows that there’s a need for development
   e. Are there any intersections around UCSD Alumni or any other resources/alumni plans to start doing peer-to-peer outreach?
      i. Waiting for results from Walk the Block, nothing concrete yet
      ii. General trend of other food pantries rely on Alumni donations

Winter Quarter CSF Report from Ellen Kim

1. Held on Feb 21-22 - right before the tuition revision,
2. Governance of each SFAC on each campus
   a. How much was going to temporary/permanent funding amongst the SFACS?
   b. Flexibility on each campus, seeing how each UC operated differently
      i. UCSB traditionally never allocated towards permanent funding
      ii. UCLA had problems with temporary funding that became for permanent funding
3. Referendum Campaign, Data Acquisition Campaign, Funding Stream Assessment Campaign
   a. Referendum Campaign – created Standing Policy 8, standardized template
   b. Data Acquisition – having large data acquisition from the SFACs at each campus
   c. Funding Stream – UCOP fee to subsidize operations
      i. In an older model, the UC system would take funds to support the UCOP office, went to a model where the campus gets to keep the funds they generate, and pay a 1.6% on expenses to cover UCOP
4. Presentation about the California State Constitutional Amendment
   a. 5% increase in student fees ($48) and how that money would be used
   b. $24 would be going towards student mental health (the original number was $148 at the beginning of the year)
      i. Historically this fee would go straight to health services
      ii. Difficult to track the 1.6% across the entirety of UCSD because its distributed across all chancellors, fragmented
   c. Giving legislature control of the UC Regents and executives

Spring Quarter Focus Groups

1. Holding Focus Groups in place of the Spring Quarter Town Hall, allowing us to put more planning and resources into a larger Fall Quarter Town Hall
2. Gauging student input on specific SSF-funded units
3. Seeing what would groups would be most focused on – i.e. student health and safety would be valuable for student input
4. Going to student councils with questions regarding these different units
   a. Keeping in consideration the types of questions for these different environments
   b. Sticker exercises would be helpful in outreach and increasing SFAC’s visibility
5. Have the Focus Groups in college councils during Week 8, precursor to the Fall Quarter Town Hall

Proposed Document Fee

1. Campuses have moved towards a one-time document fee for transcripts, replacement diplomas, other documents from the registrar’s office – current cost for transcripts is $17
2. Total value is $165, one-time fee, $100 for a graduate or visiting student, $50 for a summer school student
   a. This cost would be unlimited transcripts, documents, etc.
   b. Same price structure as UCLA
3. Considered a miscellaneous fee
4. The Office will receive self-generating revenue
5. Abuse of this system? Not necessarily an abuse issue, limited number per time going through the system, low risk
6. One of the intended benefits is allowing students to access these documents when needed in whatever quantity they need
7. $165 – based on what other campuses are doing, or is it based on UCSD specific
   a. Present day value of roughly 10 transcripts
8. Everyone is grandfathered in if they have gone through UCSD
9. If paid at UCLA, would you pay it at UCSD if you took classes?
10. Bringing it to AS/GSA for feedback
11. If a Masters student comes in and pays the fee, finishes their Masters, takes off for a year, comes back for a PhD, would they have to pay again? No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjournment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present:</strong> Paul Tchir, Jackie Markt-Maloney, Mihiri Ukuwela, Ellen Kim, Andrew Thai, Ashraf Ramzy Beshay, Darlene Nguyen, Mukanth Vaidyanathan, Norienne Saign, William McCarroll, John Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absent:</strong> Prasad Radhakrishna, Akshay Tangutur, Jennifer Huerta, Ivan Evans, Sylvia Lepe-Askari</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>