1) Received an update on two campus-based fee referenda that may be on the ASUC ballot this spring; both involve existing fees.
   • The Ink Initiative Fee would be an extension of the existing V.O.I.C.E. Fee. It would increase the existing fee from $2 to $2.50, has a build in escalator, and would support the print and online editions of the Daily Cal.
   • The Green Initiative Fund (TGIF) expires in spring 2017. This would extend the fee and increase it from $6 to $8 to expand funding for sustainability projects. The fee would increase every three years for cost inflation.

2) Student Services Fee proposals
   • Comprehensive Adaptive Sports for Students With and Without Disability abstract for ongoing funding: After deliberation in February, the committee had decided not to advance this proposal and suggested the applicants apply for Wellness Initiative Fee funding. The GA President requested this abstract be reconsidered given it is expected that this project would not be funded with wellness fee funds. Despite concerns about precedent, this project will now advance to the proposal stage for a reduced amount of funding.
   • Asian American and Pacific Islander Campus Climate Experience Study proposal for one-time, CACSSF discretionary funding: In fall 2015, this proposal was withdrawn as it was thought another campus office could do the work. Unfortunately, that office is unable to undertake this project. CACSSF decided to award $6,000 to partially fund this project.

3) The committee is looking to create an accountability structure for the CACSSF Discretionary Fund that highlights and showcases what is funded while also holding awardees accountable. A CACSSF subcommittee presented a set of recommendations regarding the goals for accountability, specific strategies to implement, and the contents of a potential one-page end-of-the-year report. The committee discussed the initial recommendations and further charged the subcommittee with the following:
   • Mock-up a google form for the end-of-the-year report; try to keep simple and to one-page
   • Explore situations and process for how unused funding might be returned to the fund
   • Identify guidelines for adhering to what was proposed in the original proposal
   • Explore a time limit for proposals that have a contingency
   • Explore adding a meeting for awardees after decisions have been communicated
   It was noted that we might start with some actions, evaluate them, and potentially add other activities in the future (e.g., awardee meeting).

4) Other issues identified for future CACSSF discussions:
   • How to increase the transparency of CACSSF’s process
   • Evaluation of the fall 2015 and spring 2016 proposal processes
   • How future increases to the Student Services Fee (SSF) might be used to fund salary and benefits increases of SSF-funded services. Without this, SSF-funded units have been experiencing the equivalent of budget cuts each year.
   • As a follow-up to CACSSF’ s recommendation from last year to have the campus create a pool of funding for Course Materials and Services Fees (CMSF) including return-to-aid, Harry
has asked the Financial Aid and Scholarships Office to develop a funding model that would include, CMSF, Miscellaneous Students Fees and return to financial aid.
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