SFAC Spring Meeting #3
4/13/15 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, Akshay Tangutur, William McCarroll, John Hughes
Absent: Ellen Kim, Mukanth Vaidyanathan, Jennifer Huerta, Norienne Saign, Ivan Evans, Sylvia Lepe-Askari

Updates to the charter

1. Consensus to not have term limits – the duration of the term will be one year
2. High turnover rate in SFAC, also allows for a reevaluation each year for each member of the committee
3. Shadows
   a. Act as a proxy/alternate for the current SFAC member
   b. Appointed in the Fall to serve two quarters
   c. Depends on individual councils to appoint the shadow
   d. Shall shadows be able to vote in place of the representative?
      i. Alternates may serve as a proxy for their representative in the case of an absence
      ii. Putting a limit on the number of times that a proxy can be used
   e. Suggestion of adding a date that they must be appointed by (Week 8 of Fall Quarter)
   f. What is our necessity for alternates? Historically SFAC is a process based committee, and alternates should match this process – they're valuable and their importance shouldn't be undermined
   g. Suggestion of having shadows attend half of the total meetings during a quarter
   h. Problem of motivation – will shadows be motivated to be active and attend meetings?
      i. Suggestion of having shadows have some sort of voting power – leads to complications
      ii. Asserting that a shadow that has good standing will most likely be appointed as representative for the next year
      iii. Allowing shadows to attend CSF trips
      iv. They should want to be here, they shouldn't be forced to be here
   i. Suggestion to have shadows attend at least half of the meetings to be informed
4. Regarding council descriptions about the SFAC position for appointments – most councils don't have a specific description about SFAC.
   a. Sending out language to colleges to standardize descriptions about SFAC representative positions
   b. Communicate that SFAC representatives will represent the student body as a whole, not just their own college's interests

     i. How do we want to define our interests as representatives?
  c. The representative is expected to train an alternate during their term
  d. Discussing whether or not we want to include information regarding SFAC duties training an alternate in council position descriptions
  e. Beneficial to explain what the Student Services Fee is, what the representative would be working with and what they would be doing
5. SFAC appointments
  a. Having a two-part interview process for appointments
  b. Ran through the CCPs and AS President with their support for a two-part interview process
  c. What impact does SFAC have if it's decided that the potential candidate isn't qualified to serve as a representative?
    i. Concerns that councils will only send one candidate to SFAC
    ii. Suggest that councils will have to send more than one potential candidate
    iii. Suggestion that there are minimum requirements for SFAC representatives
      1. It's a confirmation process, the candidate may not meet the standards laid out by the committee
  d. Period of evaluation
    i. Should evaluations be made for already current members?
    ii. Streamlined process where SFAC sits in the interview process
      1. In some colleges, position specific questions weren't allowed, lessening the importance of the interview process
    iii. The process may take weeks
    iv. Who would sit in on this process? The outgoing Chair and Vice-Chair would be involved
    v. Changing two-part interview process to a confirmation process with criteria standards outlined for candidates
      1. Suggestion to keep the two-part interview process so that is clear to candidates that there is a process
    vi. How are the confirmation processes different between the Councils and Committee?
      1. Having our own oversight would be preferred because of our own insight and background regarding SFAC
      2. What different criteria would we use if a candidate is coming in with no experience?
        a. It's mostly directed towards current membership – for new candidates, we would have minimum requirements
          i. i.e. ability to attend meetings, experience with leadership, etc.
          ii. "Safety valve"
        b. Match between the student and the committee regarding commitments and workloads – would the candidate be able to dedicate a sufficient amount of time towards the committee?
      3. Demonstrate to the councils the importance and value of the committee during the process

6. Regarding the proposal model for next year
    a. Switching towards a unit review committee
    b. Using town halls to gauge and gather input regarding student fees
    c. Proposal model is based on new income – we're at a steady state, which requires us to evolve towards an influence model
    d. How does SFAC retain our ability to retain our influence for the VCSA and our recommendations?
        i. In terms of this term, Winter Draft was approved last week
        ii. Apparent intersection between what the document supported and what the leadership supported
            1. i.e. Graduate career advising – the value of our proposal moved up when our proposal and other interests aligned
            2. i.e. Support for increasing Triton Fest – because of our proposal, support moved up again
            3. The influence of this committee does have measurable outcomes
        iii. So what about the ones that don't intersect?
            1. In experience, common goals aren't the problem, it's resources, which requires priorities to be set
            2. i.e. Safety issues, such as the blue call boxes – starts conversation at the highest levels regarding student safety

Dyads

1. What do we want our objectives be regarding these dyads and how will we address them?
2. SLS – going in and figuring out what the needs were
    a. What do students discuss most, barriers, restrictions they face, visibility issues
3. ICA – clarification issues
    a. Feedback from students, be able to clearly state what ICA does and how much SSF funds them
4. Food Insecurity
    a. Defining issues, researching existing services, identifying shortfalls and needs, potential research, defining the goals of food pantry and addressing broader issues
5. Safety and inclusion
    a. Real and perceived needs, defining issues, fix-it requests, promoting resources, student workgroup, lighting

Adjournment

Present: Paul Tchir, Jackie Markt-Maloney, Prasad Radhakrishna, Mihiri Ukuwela, Andrew Thai, Ashraf Ramzy Beshay, Darlene Nguyen, Mukanth Vaidyanathan, Jennifer Huerta, Norienne Saign, Ivan Evans

Absent: Ellen Kim, Akshay Tangutur, William McCarroll, Sylvia Lepe-Askari, John Hughes