



## Student Success Fee Allocation Advisory Committee Meeting

Monday, May 11, 2022

### MEETING RECORD

<b>Members Present:</b>	Tess Loarie	Thomas Gutierrez
	Cynthia Vizcaíno Villa	Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore (absent)
	Isaac Lopez	Yukie Murphy
	Alexander Ameri	Angela Kraetsch – <i>non-voting</i>
	Natalie Estilo	Derek Gragson – <i>non-voting</i>
	Jordan Perlas	
	Thomas Tang	
<b>Staff/Guests:</b>	David Valadez	
	Jen Haft	
<b>Meeting Recorder:</b>	Cindy Pilg	

#### Call to Order

Co-Chair Loarie called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m.

#### Review/Approve Meeting Record

Motion to approve the 4/11/22 Meeting Record by Ms. Estilo, seconded by Mr. Lopez. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

#### Review SSF Base Funding Proposals

Co-chair Villa reviewed the SSF Funding Request Summary and indicated that the first five proposals listed were clearly top ranked: (1) disability resource center access specialists, (2) off-campus housing support program, (3) BEACoN Research and Mentoring Program, (4) Student Engagement and (5) WITH US Program. She requested confirmation of the total available funding. Ms. Haft stated that her records indicated total available funding of \$489,000.

Co-chair Villa suggested the committee invite proposal submitters to the next meeting to present the top four to five proposals in order for the committee to decide how to allocate funds and have an opportunity to discuss other ranked proposals.

#### Discuss Funding Priorities

Co-chair Loarie stated she was in alignment with the top five proposals as listed on the summary and added that she felt the Cal Poly Scholars proposal would be more appropriate for Cal Poly Opportunity Fee (CPOF) funding, not Student Success Fee (SSF) funding. Ms. Estilo indicated that she ranked the top five as listed on the summary as well. Ms. Perlas agreed with the top five. Mr. Lopez agreed with #1 and #2 priorities and would rank Cal Poly Scholars higher; however, he mentioned that it made sense to garner funding elsewhere after considering the committee's comments. Mr. Ameri agreed that Cal Poly Scholars funding should come from other funds.

Mr. Gutierrez indicated that he ranked Cal Poly Scholars higher. He mentioned that he understood the budget to be \$449,000 and was attempting to bring more proposals into the top 5 which may have compromised his voting. Mr. Tang supported Cal Poly Scholars being considered by CPOF for funding. Ms. Murphy stated that she ranked the top five in similar order and indicated that it would be helpful to hear from the presenters and ask questions to seek understanding of proposals. She added that she agreed with and appreciated the students' perspectives given this is a student-funded fee – the other proposals are very important and may be eligible for funding from other sources. Mr. Gragson stated that the Cal Poly Scholars ranked high and agreed with what has been said by other committee members.

Mr. Ameri stated that he felt the survey results were skewed given the way the survey was created and that the Cal Poly Scholars should have ranked higher as noted in the straw poll results. Co-chair Villa indicated that the survey was not statistically perfect and was intended to initiate discussion only. She added that she felt CPOF is where Cal Poly Scholars is best suited for funding.

Co-chair Villa inquired how many presentations the committee would be interested in requesting. Co-chair Loarie suggested the top five proposals. Mr. Ameri suggested adding another proposal presentation. Co-chair Villa recommended five presentations given the standard length of the committee meetings. Ms. Perlas agreed with the recommendation. There being no additional comments by the committee, the discussion was concluded.

#### **Next Steps**

Co-chair Villa confirmed that the top five proposal submitters will be contacted to provide presentations in advance for committee review and to schedule brief presentations at the next committee meeting. In addition, the committee will vote on allocations of funding at the following meeting. Jen Haft clarified that the next meeting is scheduled on May 23rd for presentations and the following meeting is scheduled on May 25th for discussion and voting.

Mr. Gutierrez asked for clarification with regard to the top five presentations being the proposals as listed on the summary with priority ranked 1-5. Co-chair Villa confirmed and extended her appreciation to the committee for their diligence and time in this regard.

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Tess Loarie (May 24, 2022 18:18 PDT)

Tess Loarie, Co-Chair