

SFCIC Report Spring 2015

Procedure:

1. Members thoroughly read all proposals prior to the first meeting.
2. Members complete an Excel Spreadsheet that indicate their funding preference and whether or not it merits a presentation.
3. This data is compiled and proposals are ranked in order of most favored to least favored.
4. The committee begins with the “most favored” proposals and briefly discusses each proposal to ensure that all arguments are heard.
5. The committee proceeds with this process until more controversial proposals are reached.
6. The committee then begins with the “least favored” proposals and has brief discussion to ensure that all arguments are heard.
7. The committee utilizes future meetings to discuss the controversial proposals.

Parameters for Funding for Spring 2015:

1. Minimum request: \$1500
2. Maximum request: \$50000
3. Tangible
4. Stored on campus when not in use
5. Shelf life of 5+ years
6. No items used exclusively for curriculum
7. No individually-tailored items

Issues:

1. Website
 - a. Many were unable to submit proposals
 - b. Had to be manually submitted by admins
2. Membership
 - a. Each year committee struggles with 100% attendance
 - b. Student membership is inconsistent
3. Proposals involving construction
 - a. Price quotes seemed low
 - b. Often times didn't consider all costs associated with construction
 - c. Many did not consult with Campus Design
 - d. Many did not include source of price quote or appropriate documentation

Recommendations for Spring 2016:

1. Website
 - a. Changes to verbiage and layout on application
 - b. Include prompt for construction proposals to ask about Campus Design approvals
2. Announcement Date
 - a. Keep end of January deadline, but announce and market earlier
3. Marketing
 - a. Continue with MU Info and emails to Deans of Colleges

- b. Add:
 - i. MSA, GPC, GSA
 - ii. Divisional Councils
 - iii. SLAC
 - iv. ORG
 - v. Monitors in Student Center
- 4. Review membership process
 - a. MSA and GPC appoint positions later in Fall Semester?
 - b. Application process?

Comments:

Due to the aforementioned procedure and parameters for funding, the committee was able to finish the review process in two, 1.5 hour meetings. The committee was able to have thorough and thoughtful discussion and quickly deliver decisions because of their personal preliminary review. This process works very well and I do hope it continues. We conducted one more meeting after concluding "official business" to discuss issues faced and changes for the following year. It was a very successful semester with some awesome people. It has been a pleasure to serve.