



Student Services Fee Advisory Board

OPEN BOARD MEETING

Monday, February 29th, 2016

4:30PM-5:30PM

Copper Room, SUMC

1. Meeting called to order at 3:09PM

2. Roll Call

- Member Crocco – *present*
- Secretary Durr – *present*
- Member Gittens – *present*
- Member Harris – *present*
- Co-Chair Havey – *present*
- Treasurer Jean-Louis – *present*
- Member Karaman – *present*
- Member Scibilia – *absent*
- Member Stewart – *present*
- Co-Chair Zaman – *present*
- Member Zaroni – *present*

3. New Business: Proposal Review & Final (Pre-Open Board) Voting

SF17.07	<p><u>GPSC Club Funding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• They are asking for \$15,200 for one year. The ratio between ASUA and GPSC shows that twice the amount is given to undergrads rather than grads. GPSC clubs can request funding from ASUA, but there are more rules.• These clubs expect to be able reapply, and a cut could be more disastrous to this than on new projects in POD.• GPSC is asking for \$15,000 and matching with \$5,000 from their own funding.• Putting money in different areas might be more important.• GPSC clubs can go to the undergrad pool for some things, but it's still not enough.• We have more remaining funding than we expected to at this point, so we should give them the full amount.• However, we shouldn't just give this proposal its additional funding because we just realized we had extra funding.
---------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 33% of a cut is consistent with ASUA's cut. • Adding in \$100 for the Admin Service Charge is fair. • Voting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All in favor of \$10,100: unanimous
SF17.09	<p><u>GPSC Professional Opportunities Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We all cut money from it. In past years, GPSC has supplied \$10,000, so we could match it. They also provide the stipend from their own funding. • For this, we are just handing out money, so it's difficult to determine a number. • We'd be cutting more than half! \$12,500 might be better. • This is new money spent on new things, rather than contributing to the infrastructure of other programs.. • Voting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In favor of partial (\$10K): 9 ○ Abstain: 1
SF17.10	<p><u>GPSC Research and Project Grant Funding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking for \$110,700, but they didn't include tuition for their graduate student, which raises it to \$122,000. • It costs \$30,700 just to pay the graduate student. • Research and Project Grants, in the past didn't receive as many applications, so they raised the cap to \$2,000 for lab equipment, supplies, compensation, etc. (it may go down again this upcoming year) • Fine Arts is the only college that isn't receiving their fair share, but they're making those efforts to reach out. • Everyone who doesn't receive funding gets specific feedback and helps them apply in the future. • Most of the judges are volunteer faculty and students, or committee members. The requirements now include a general rep for GPSC. The grad students oversees the info structure, managing those funds, following-up, ensuring responsible spending, and accounting for all purchases. It's managing a serious amount of money and a lot of work. By getting rid of the position, this process couldn't exist. It would entail a serious restricting of other paid employees in GPSC. • Last year, we gave \$106,800. The average disbursement is \$1,500-\$1,600. • Travel grants are dealing with a smaller total and more people, so it would be best to find a balance between these proposals. • Voting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tentative \$75,000 (possibly coming back)

SF17.11	<p><u>GPSC Travel Grants Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They want to give \$250 (\$500→\$750) more per person when compared to the past. (This past year this change took place, but they will probably bring it down this upcoming year). • This is a flagship program that is very competitive and is one of the most crucial things for graduate students. • There were just shy of 1000 requests last year, so it is in very high demand. • It could always be more competitive since it is a grant. • By cutting funds, we're only making it more competitive and not taking out specific jobs. • This is not a proposal that the university should fund, and should fall under SSFAB. By cutting funding, we aren't saying this is a bad program, and will encourage them to continue applying when we have more funding. • GPSC will be matching some of these funds as well. • Voting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All in favor of \$153,500: 9 ○ All in favor of more funding: 1
SF17.19	<p><u>Student Faculty Engagement Programs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They want to have \$1,000 at each spot on campus, which is a lot for a limited amount of programming. Each center will still have \$5-6,000. This program provides interactions for students to meet with faculty and get more comfortable approaching them. • \$80,000 seems like the majority opinion: faculty and ERE, and engagement program. • We appreciate the concept of the program, but can't afford to give them that much funding. • Voting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In favor of \$80,000: 9 ○ Opposed to all funding: 1
SF17.24	<p><u>University Emergency Medical Services</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many people see this as providing overlap of what is already offered through the city of Tucson. • This provides professional experience for students to put on their resume. • The response time is better than what the city/hospitals provide. \$100,000 is fair. • Wages are problematic. They say they're going to do it as a stipend, but that isn't how they answered the question. This is an easy way to cut \$70,000 and it isn't necessary to provide wages. It has been volunteer-based in the past,

	<p>though the chiefs make money.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They want to purchase new vehicles. They currently have a suburban and golf cart, so we could cut these expenses and leave them with supplies, contract costs, etc. • The hybrid volunteer/wages situation makes it easy to cut. • They don't need a new vehicle because they only have a certain amount of people working at a car and there is no need to just sit around in a car • It's a growing club, and while the wages aren't right, the vehicle would allow for continued growth. • This fits into the survey by addressing professional development, safety, and pseudo employment. • By providing a vehicle now, we would be setting it up in case funding disappears in the future. Operations are things they can't legally operate without. • Operations are things they'd need to pay for whether they had 10 students working for them or 100. The vehicle makes the most sense to cut. • If we get the vehicle, we'd have to pay the wages, which would increase that overall price to the point we can't afford. • If we take away wages and vehicle, it puts us at \$90,408 for the single year. • Adding a buffer of \$10,000 could help offset the costs of maintenance. However, \$95,000 would be better. • Throwing around a few extra thousand dollars just to round things out isn't beneficial for smaller programs who could really benefit from this. • Their funding structure would require a PAR. Plus, they can't pay half of minimum wage. They didn't budget for a stipend, and it sounds tricky overall. For a stipend, you can't tell someone when and where to work. • Rounding up to a \$91,500. • Voting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All in favor for \$91,500 for one year: unanimous
	<p><u>Career Services</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is obviously not enough funding to meet the minimum needs of this proposal, so there's no purpose in just throwing money at it. • They don't provide clear evidence for a pressing need in regard to the number of people hired to do the work. • Voting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All in favor of no funding: 8 ○ Abstain / out of the room: 2

4. Revisiting Other Decisions

- What can we give more money to?
 - i. PASS & Project Rush makes sense because any additional funding goes directly towards benefitting students.
 - 1. PASS: \$15,000 towards employee wages, so they could employ more students and serve more students who are struggling.
 - a. **Voting**
 - i. All in favor of \$155,000 for one year: unanimous
 - ii. Scholarship Universe – we have good justification in where we decided on those numbers.
 - iii. Faculty Fellows – we cut their operations funding in half (though not specifically to that line)
 - iv. GPSC
 - 1. **Voting**
 - a. All in favor of \$15,200: unanimous
 - v. GPSC Project and Grant Funding: The quantity served should increase. This is more of a priority, and reaching maybe 22 people out of all the graduate students. If we're paying for a grad student but not giving them enough work to do, we're defeating the purpose. An extra bump to club funding may be more
 - 1. **Voting**
 - a. All in favor of \$88,800: unanimous
- Multi-year funding confirmed for the following:
 - i. Student Legal
 - ii. Campus Events and Engagement
 - iii. Immigrant Resource Center
 - iv. Project Pave the Way
 - 1. This funding is for new programming related to identity-based oppressions and provides stability

5. WRC Par

- Requesting a change in fund designation from Director Salary to Operations for the amount of \$5,000 and to travel for the amount of \$4,000 for a total of \$9,000.
 - i. Supports professional development
 - ii. Giving back \$2,000 to SSFAB
 - 1. **Voting**
 - a. All in favor of approving PAR: unanimous

6. Open Board Chat

- Next week:
 - i. Monday @4:30PM in the Copper Room (SUMC)
 - 1. As a board, we are expected to show up at 4PM/4:15PM in business formal dress
 - 2. The project contacts will be arriving at 4:30PM
 - 3. We will expect to adjourn at 5:30PM at the latest
 - ii. Friday @3:30 in El Portal (Saguaro Room)
 - 1. As a board, we are expected to arrive at 3/3:15
- Each person is responsible for presenting the proposals we researched for the closed board room
- Whoever introduced the proposal gives the summary (1.5 minutes), then “moves to approve SSF# for \$__ for __years” and then yields to the chair.
 - i. Other board members come in and make amendments, add discussion, etc.
 - ii. Call the question / wait until discussion runs out
- We will also draft our board’s opinion and advice on the proposals we are responsible for. Nick will be sending out an example of this.

7. Recruitment

- Teresa sent out an email about the application process (opening on March 2nd, closing March 23rd by 5PM)
- If you aren’t graduating, you’re encouraged to return!
- We have ads to place in the Daily Wildcat and distribute around campus.
 - i. Send to listservs: ASUA, GPSC, Greek Life, etc.
- Anyone who isn’t applying for an at-large position will help with the interviewing process
- Last year, we had 8 applications and chose 6, but we would be happy to have 12-15!
- Word of mouth is always a good method ☺

8. Adjournment: 4:34PM