Members Present: Kyriacos Koupparis (co-chair), Marnie Noel, Debbie Ruelas, Alyssa Abraham, Taylor Landon, Michael Levesque, Ifeyinwa Asiodu, Gabe Quitoriano, Jenny Cohen, Lawrence Lin, Sam Pitak, Abby Burns

Faculty: Mark Rollins (co-chair)

Ex-Officio Members Present: Tracey Gearlds, Eric Koenig, Lisa Raskulinec

Staff Present: Karen Hamblett, Michael Villanueva

Absent: Joseph Castro

Call to Order: Kyriacos called the meeting to order at 5:40 pm.

Office of Career & Professional Development Presentation

Bill Lindstaedt presented on behalf of OCPD. Their funding comes 43% from the Executive Budget Committee, 43% from Student Services Fee and 14% from generated revenue.

Kyriacos asked if the one on one appointment statistic of 839 was unique visits or if it included repeats. Bill said the total included repeats visits and said that next year they would be able to segment the data more specifically and showed the resulting data from using C3M, the new tracking tool, for 3 months. The new tool will be able to track topic trends as well – what students are coming in to talk about. They will be able to track diversity by using the information the Registrar’s office inputs (Bill admitted they needed to validate the diversity data).

Kyriacos asked how the UCSF alumni networking database was being used. Bill said that it was for grads or UCSF alumni who have lost their jobs to make connections. Nursing seems to be using most frequently right now even though it’s relatively new.

Michael L. asked about what OCPD was doing to reach sociology, anthropology and history students. Bill said that 90% of the graduate students they served were life sciences students. Kathleen Cassidy (OCPD) noted that she has put together research talk clinics and panels for them. In addition, she said that students in the behavioral sciences have a smaller number and less obvious career opportunities so she helps them figure out some avenues to pursue.

Ifeyinwa asked about the breakdown of nursing students who use OCPD services – specifically the alumni database. Bill said that MEPN as well as doctoral students use it fairly frequently but didn’t have statistics as to that specific of a breakdown.

Alyssa asked about the decrease in carry-forward reserve. Bill said the decrease was mainly due to increased benefit costs.

Student Activity Center

Maureen Conway presented for the SAC. She highlighted that with the funds SSF allocated last year for a multi-media specialist that PLUS and the website have been revamped as well as Passport to Wellness and Passport to Success.
Synapse

She stated that a new full time Associate Director (not funded with SSF fund) – Majjza Sanchez is requesting programming funding to spearhead some new projects in SAC. The temporary funding request of $15,000 is outlined in their proposal. In addition they are requesting $3,800 in permanent funding to cover operational expenses associated with the new FTE. Abby asked if the Office of Diversity would be able to offer program funding for some of these new ideas. Maureen said yes. It is a situation where they would provide matching funding where appropriate. Kyriacos asked if the programs are successful would they request permanent funding the following year. Maureen said they intend to seek partnership opportunities where possible and they would most likely ask for permanent funding after they had hard data to support the request.

Lawrence asked if Maureen knew the percentage of graduate students that participate in RCO’s. Maureen said she knew of a few for certain like Women in Life Sciences which has 80+ active members, Minority Graduate Students has 18-25+ members and Beer Brewer’s at Mission Bay has 75+ active members.

Student Resource Center at Mission Bay

Pam Belluomini presented for the Student Resource Center at Mission Bay. She has spent extensive time attempting to find space at Mission Bay for the Student Resource Center. The only space she has been able to find is designated as vendor space which is income generating space. In order for the center to have they space they need to pay rent. The space is slated to open on March 28th and will have hours of Monday – Thursday 8:00 am – 10:00 pm and Friday’s 8:00 am – 6:00 pm with a proxy card. The workspace will consist of conference table/meeting space, some storage and two (2) workstations. There will be a resource information line based out of this office. The goal is to have a student worker (work study or not) be in the space from 6:00 pm-10:00 pm.

Sam asked when the space is opened how the rent will be paid. Pam stated that on a temporary basis Student Academic Affairs (SAA) will pay the rent. Mark asked who receives the rent. Pam said the Campus Life Services (CLS) receives it. Tracey added that since this space is designated for retail space by the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Committee they must cover the actual costs of the space. Pam added that it’s a 5-year lease and there isn’t any other space to be found for this center. Lisa noted that there aren’t new spaces designated for student use because there is no state funding for it. Mark countered that Parnassus has plenty of unfunded space why none at Mission Bay. Michael V. explained a bit of the history of state funding and the bottom line is that those spaces at Parnassus were created when there was state funding for students to cover the costs and now during the time that Mission Bay is being built that space is either funded by revenue or research dollars. Karen mentioned that with the cuts in state funding the now unfunded spaces at Parnassus need to be subsidized. Mark suggested this maybe warranted a letter to the Chancellor since using SSF funds to pay rent for space for student use on the campus was unprecedented and didn’t seem like a good use of the limited funds. Jenny asked if there was an opportunity to partner with another vendor in order to partially subsidize the rent. Pam stated that she has a proposal ready should there be an opportunity for vendor/donor sponsorship. In reality the space is a low priority in the greater scheme of UCSF donor solicitation. There are strict rules about the look and feel of the space as well that limit the ability to place signage, etc. Kyriacos asked what would happen if the SSF can’t fund the space or if the space is funded but no operations. Pam said that SAA would cover the expense for now. Mark asked her if she would rather have the SAO II or the space funded. Pam stated the space would be the first priority but it would be beneficial to have the SAO II since she is a one-woman show right now and can’t meet all the needs or take a vacation. Lisa mentioned there may be an opportunity to share space with another student group who seems to be underutilizing there space.

Synapse

Tim Neagle came to speak at the request of the committee along with several students who work on the newspaper. Questions the Committee had that were asked via e-mail before Tim’s presentation were:

1. Is there a possibility of going to an on-line only newspaper and what is the plan for future?
2. How are you determining if you are meeting student needs and covering their interests?
3. If the paper is supposed to be for the students – by the students why is there so much managing/overhead cost compared to what the student writers are paid?
4. What are your plans to use your reserve?

Highlights of Tim’s presentation included:

- Synapse provides news about UCSF you can’t find anywhere else
- Synapse provides outlet and opportunity for students who are science focused to stretch their creativity
- The paper is gradually gravitating to web-only content – 700 visits to last week’s edition vs. 3000 printed with some left over
Web ad revenue is increasing with the improving economy while print ads are declining to practically zero – the website offers a college consortium for advertising (advertise in Stanford, UCSF, etc. together for one price)

The students gave testimonials about their experience on the paper and what they like about it.

**Eric** asked how many other people from the campus were involved with the paper. **Tim** stated there were 100+ contributors.

**Abby** asked that if printing is declining why isn’t the printing cost decreasing on the budget and why if ad revenue is increasing is it the same on the budget. **Tim** said that yes in general the print cost is decreasing but if the volume decreases the cost per copy will increase and printing costs in general are increasing. **Kyriacos** asked who much of the ad revenue total came from print ads. **Tim** said about a quarter of the revenue comes from print ads. **Mark** asked if the projected ad income for this year was on target. **Tim** said yes, maybe even will be more.

**Jenny** asked about the longevity of the printer in light of the economy and declines in print production. **Tim** said that Howard Quinn has a long standing partnership with UCSF and a very strong relationship. It’s not only about the financial bottom line but people too. **Eric** asked when the last time the cost of printing was increased by Howard Quinn and **Tim** responded that if had only increased 1 time in 10 years. **Gabe** asked how much it cost to print and issue. **Tim** responded that the Performing Arts edition would run approximately $2,000 because it had more color than usual. **Alyssa** asked if Tim thought the number of print issues would decrease again next year and **Tim** responded that yes he thought it would, maybe down to 3,000.

**Mark** asked how the paper sought feedback from its readers or those involved with the paper, maybe via a survey? **Tim** responded that he didn’t have time to put together and administer a survey. **Mark** said they need to reach out to see if the students’ needs are being met. Maybe a surveymonkey.com option within the PLUS e-mail would best reach the students and one of the questions could be “how likely would you be to read Synapse on-line”

**Voting:** None at this meeting

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