The meeting started at 5:39 PM, and Matthew C. motioned for prior meeting minute’s approval, and the committee agreed.

**Discussions & Recommendations:**

**Family Services:**

The committee engaged in a lengthy discussion about Family Service, and whether the requested $7,500 is worth funding the Sitter City contract. Some members expressed concern over the amount of families that really exist among the student body. During the discussion, a committee member looked up Sitter City’s rates for an average person to use their site, and found they match the contract numbers proposed by Suzie on March 4th ($140 per year, or $30 per month), meaning there is no savings for students who want to sign-up to babysit for other. The possibility of a scholarship was brought up, but then a committee member mentioned it would be good to know how many students have their own families, as well as how many of them live in the surrounding area which would actually be able to utilize the services. At this point, Michael V. had to clarify that the funding request of $7,500 would be for two years. A majority of the committee members found the service to be beneficial to student families overall, and would like data to be incorporated in next year’s proposal to track the usage of the Sitter City service.

The committee unanimously voted to fund Family Services at the proposed 2014-15 level.

**Review:**

Matthew C. mentioned that when GSA met, he invited the members to comment on their thoughts regarding Synapse and there was a concern over the voting outcome. They came up with numbers that would make Synapse still happen on a reduced budget, and would keep the FTE at 75% to guide the students.

A committee member then asked if it is possible to amend the prior vote, which they were then told the committee voted without complete numbers. It was decided that a budget of $50,000 would destroy Synapse. While the committee overall values the paper, they do not feel their $200,000 funding request is justified, nor do they agree students should be paid to write articles, or that lunches should be provided for their meetings. Michael V. then reminded the committee that last week they wanted to reduce the temporary funding by 5%, then mentioned that essentially the 2014-15 budget would be $190,000.

There was a lot of deliberation over whether to fund Synapse, or to “kill it”. A committee member that attended the GAS meeting mentioned they found out that over 100 people write to Synapse, while 30 work on the paper, and said it is professional development where students would still do the work if they weren’t being fed lunches or being paid the small amount for the articles they write. It was mentioned that if Synapse were to go away, then funds can be allocated to other units who deserve and need the
funding, OCPD being one of them. The committee was greatly concerned about incorporating their peer’s thoughts and feelings into their decision and came up with multiple scenarios of how the paper could still exist without the editor, mainly looking at OCPD taking over and allocating additional funding to cover this extra task.

The committee voted to keep the funding at 95% for 2014-15, and at 75% for 2015-16 with nine members voting yes, and three opposing.

After voting, the committee decided they would like a survey conducted on the readership of Synapse, but do not want Synapse to do the survey as they want “real student feedback”. A process or time to send out the survey was not decided on.

Specific Recommendations:

Arts & Events:
The committee would like to see better advertising, and mentioned the Chancellor’s Concert Series as an example. They believe it would help to identify one to two students from each school to advertise events like Fitness and Recreation currently does.

Student Health:
The committee would like Student Health to come with multiple numbers on UC SHIP vs. Insurance rates next year, and would like to know the cost of co-pays.

Feedback on Committee Process:
The committee would like the process to start earlier with organization of the committee, and would like the first meeting to occur before the winter break, or in early January, but like the current time frame. The committee would also like to ask members of the new student government to commit to being on the Student Service Fee committee for the allowable two years, and would like first year students to be considered to sit in on the meetings if they would like to be involved the following year.

Don asked which processes can be improved, and mentioned the amount of time allowed to present. Jennifer then mentioned they can consider reaching out to each unit and asking them to bring a student with them to their presentation so the committee can understand the student use of their unit. In response to concern over the process starting earlier, Jennifer mentioned she can start recruiting for the committee in October.

Don closed the meeting with some comments, mentioning he appreciated the student’s time on this committee and that he really enjoyed the pleasant process this year.

Voting: See above under “Discussions & Recommendations” section for voting outcomes.

Adjournment: 7:24 PM