Josh and Don called the meeting to order at 5:45 pm then asked the Committee to reintroduce themselves for Diana's benefit.

Josh asked if everyone had read the previous three sets of meeting minutes and if so who would motion to approve. Jason approved and Becky seconded. Eight committee members were in favor of approval, none were opposed and none abstained.

Pam Belluomini presented for Mission Bay Student Resource Center

Copies of her proposal for your binders will be distributed at the next meeting.

Discussion Summary:

Austin thanked Pam for all the hard work she and her Center have done at Mission Bay. He said he had never heard of the Inside Line so was wondering where advertised to students. Pam replied that it’s advertised in the Inside Guide and that plans are being made to promote it elsewhere. She emphasized it’s not a helpline.

Austin asked why bagel Tuesdays were always in Genentech Hall and noted that moving the location around more or having it at the shuttle stop may attract more students. Pam agreed and said they had recently discovered a coffee cart service they may start to use which would be good at the shuttle stops. She wants to be careful not to compete with the vendors at MB who sell coffee. She also likes to use the opportunity to engage students in conversation and gather their input.

Josh understood the MB Student Resource Center wants to offer more services to students but wanted to know what other funding Pam was pursuing or did she already have. Pam responded that Student Academic Affairs pays for some salary and benefits but that if the MB SRC wasn’t partially funded from SSF funds then SAA would still support them but cut services somewhere else to offset the costs. She noted the Center has a total of 2.5 FTE.

Jason noted that there seemed to be some overlap between services that Student Activities Center on Parnassus provided and what the MB SRC did. Pam replied that they filled different needs such as the MB SRC oversees the student lounge and closet, events, etc. and that while the MB SRC held events were open to all students the goal was to be the interface for MB students. Doug noted that since Pam said that SAC and MB SRC activities are different has she thought of having some of the services at Parnassus as well. Pam reiterated that the primary intent was to focus on MB students since it was a new campus not yet fully developed. She added that they kept Parnassus schedules and shuttle rides in mind when planning events.

Don asked Pam if she had considered some other ways to generate revenue. Pam responded that she had thought about website advertising and in the Inside Guide and there is precedent for doing it but since they are still in the early days of being a center she hasn’t pursued those ideas yet. She mused that it would be nice if the MB SRC could fill a gap by selling items that aren’t as readily available now since the bookstore closed but that would mean cash handling and add a level of complexity to what they are just beginning to do at the Center.

Becky asked what percentage of students reserve the meeting space in the resource center. Pam responded approximately 85%
Jason asked about the $1,600 communications budget. Pam replied that the budget covered land line phones, mail stops and cell phones of which there are several related to the Center.

Shane Snowden presented for LGBT Resource Center
Discussion Summary:
Becky asked if Shane had focused any outreach to students in lab settings. Shane replied that she had done a panel called “Out in Science” at MB. She noted the students seem to prefer a more low profile setting in the hard science environment for networking either via lunches or coffee hours or their own social networking.

Jason noted that the LGBT RC had funding from other sources prior to SSF funding and that now roughly 25% of Shane’s salary is covered by SFF funding to serve 3000 students even though she serves faculty, staff and patients who are a much larger population. Shane responded that SSF funding actually covers about 19% of her salary because the Medical Center chips in about $30k in salary costs. The $30k from SSF includes benefits and some non-salary costs for programming. She added that historically her position was funded from University Advancement and Planning as a result of a public relations solution to UCSF’s lack of focus on LGBT issues. She has had an Office of the President Be Smart About Safety grant for her work with staff that expires this year. She hopes to have that funding gap covered by Diversity and Outreach, her new umbrella organization which comprises 50% of her salary.

Jason asked where UCSF campus funding or support was for the LGBT RC and Shane reiterated that she Diversity and Outreach would hopefully provide the campus support. Josh noted he acknowledged that Shane provided a valuable resource and that the students realize it and are happy to fund her work but how do we get the campus to buy in to the idea of paying its fair share for her services - where is the support for this important cause that the campus is proud to have. Shane heard and understood what Josh was saying.

Brooke wanted to know if any student organizations are involved in the LGBT RC. Shane explained that the LGBT Student Association is very active in supporting and participating in LGBT RC events, and that the LGBT RC actively supports the student organization.

Don asked if Shane had considered expanding the LGBT National Summit for Medical Leaders to other professions and to charge a fee for it. Shane replied that the summit has been funded by the California Endowment and California Wellness Foundation. She is in the process of putting one together for nursing as a 1-day part of their annual conference. She is working with Pharmacy and Dentistry professional organizations as an initial step to have language added to their mission statements about LGBT.

Doug asked if she had pursued external funding to support her Center in general and Shane replied that it is difficult to acquire operational cost funding especially when UCSF is perceived as having deep pockets. It’s easier to gain financial support for specific events or programs.

Misty Loetterle presented for Diversity and Outreach – Multicultural Resource Center.
Discussion Summary:
Jason wanted to know why students should be funding a Vice Chancellor’s office when it’s something the campus in general should fund. Misty explained that, funding for their newly formed office was pieced together by combining compliance program funding such as Affirmative Action and Sexual Harassment Prevention and some program funding that came with other units that moved under the Diversity and Outreach umbrella – for example LGBT Resource Center. Budget cuts resulting from Operational Excellence have adversely impacted this new area. She stated the role Diversity and Outreach serves is for students too even if it seems somewhat intangible - it’s still important for students. Jason took issue with the fact that the campus has made cuts in the name of efficiency then asked students to pay for the shortfalls. Misty responded that other campuses have similar offices that are funded, at least in part, from student fees. Eric added that a group of students wrote the original proposal resulting in the formation of the Multicultural Resource Center. Since there is a shared desire there should be shared responsibility to fund as well. Michael added that the trend in funding over the last few years and in the foreseeable future in light of drastic state budget cuts is to have programs or activities more
closely match the intended revenue source. The other alternative is to cut services or raise student tuition which no one wants to do. If students wish to preserve services then they need to fund them from the intended revenue source.

Josh expressed that there is a general frustration among students because it seems like every time funding needs to be found it falls to students to pay more. Michael explained that historically the SSF was created because there was more demand for student services. The fee and fund were created to directly pay for services the students wanted. Misty added that the MCRC is trying to create programming that directly benefits students, but there is a cost associated with it. Brooke commented that the $15,000 they are requesting is a very small amount of the overall budget.

Dennis said that OCPD’s work with health sciences professionals seemed redundant when compared with some services the MCRC offers. Misty responded that gaps were identified where specific needs of underserved minorities weren’t being met. The MCRC focuses on filling those gaps while closely working with OCPD (and other services) so as not to overlap with services they provide for students.

Doug commented that if Diversity and Outreach served as an umbrella organization why did LGBT come to the committee with a separate request. Misty replied that LGBT is under D&O and that in the future they would probably come as one unit. This year since the MCRC is new and Shane has been doing her work and communicating directly with the committee for the past several years they decided to make their requests and speak separately.

Voting: None at this meeting

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 PM.