Charge of Committee:
The charge to the Student Fee Capital Improvements Committee is to advise the vice chancellor for Student Affairs on the allocation of funds generated by the capital improvements portion of the student activities fee.

Committee Procedure:
1. The first meeting was for introductions and to inform new members on the committee's charge and the rules that must be followed. The guidelines were discussed and the scorecard system was explained.
2. Committee members (students and faculty) were asked to read all proposals on the SFCIC website. Each member was issued a funding scorecard to fill out prior to the first meeting to discuss funding. Each proposal's ID, description, and min/max funding amounts were listed. Members were asked to select "Yes/No/Partial" to determine funding for each proposal and specify a funding amount in the case of a partial vote.
3. All committee members sent their scorecards to the student chair, Adam Gentry, who compiled the results into one single scorecard. A "Yes" is worth one point, a "No" is worth 0 points, and a "Partial" is worth 0.5 points.
4. At the second meeting, the committee discussed first proposals with unanimous support and then proposal with no support and funding decisions were reached.
5. At the third meeting, the remaining relatively controversial proposals were debated and funding decisions were made.
6. The student chair of the committee informed all applicants of the status of their proposals.

Funding Guidelines for Spring 2017:
All requested items must:
- Be tangible
- Be stored on University property when not in use
- Have an estimated useful life of five years or more
- Not be curriculum-based items (i.e. equipment that is singularly used for a single course)
- Be capable of usage by students present and future (no personalized items)
- Cost a minimum of $1,500
- Cost a maximum of $50,000

Recommendations:
1. The website (SFCIC.missouri.edu) must be updated.
2. Proposals from previous years should be archived.
3. Meeting schedule needs updating

Conclusions:
Overall, this committee is incredibly efficient and effective. While the committee members met only three times, the bulk of the time was spent by each member individually in reviewing all 44 proposals submitted. Using the scorecard system, the 44 proposals were reviewed in two 1.5-hour meetings. There are 14 proposals that were fully funded, 16 proposals that received partial funding and 14 proposals that received no funding. Serving as chair of this committee has been a pleasure: working with students and learning what is important for them and what they valued the most, was eye opening and helped me better understand and communicate with our students.

Sincerely,
Dorina Kosztin (committee chair, faculty)