**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

**2206 Murphy Hall**

**4:30-6:30pm**

**Tuesday, October 15, 2019**

**Present:**

Graduates: Denise Marshall, Janay Williams, Brittnee Meitzenheimer

Undergraduates: Nicole Corona Diaz (Chair), Atreyi Mitra, Paulina Macias

Administration: Carina Salazar, Associate Director, Career Center, Kevin Kilgore, Police Lieutenant, UCPD

Faculty Rep: Karen Rowe, Professor Emerita

SFAC Advisor: Christine Wilson, Interim Director of Career Center and Executive Director of Graduate Student Resource Center (Ex-Officio)

APB Advisor: Ellen Hermann (Ex-Officio)

**Absent**:

Deb Geller, Associate Dean of Students

**Call to Order**

1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** called the meeting to order at 4:33pm.
2. **Approval of Agenda**
	1. **Kevin Kilgore** moved to approve the agenda**, Atreyi Mitra** seconded**.** With no objections, the agenda was approved by consent.
3. **Review Handouts**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** confirmed that the committee had access to an invoice from the Council of Student Fees (CSF), Unit Review questions compiled from last meeting, including recommended updates from **Deb Geller**, and the full Call Letter that last year’s SFAC committee sent out to units.
4. **Review and Approval of Minutes**
	1. **Kevin Kilgore** moved to approve the minutes from 10.08.19, **Denise Marshall** seconded.With no objections, the minutes from 10.08.19 were approved by consent.
5. **Vice Chair Election**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the floor to discuss the SFAC Committee Vice Chair Election.
	2. **Christine Wilson** stated that **Eliza Franklin-Edmonson** has notified the committee of her resignation and will not be serving on the SFAC committee for the remainder of the year.
	3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** clarified that because **Eliza Franklin-Edmonson** is no longer serving on the committee, she is not eligible to accept her nomination for the Vice Chair position. As a result, **Atreyi Mitra** is the only eligible committee member to accept a nomination for the Vice Chair position. With only one potential candidate, the SFAC committee will still hold a Vice Chair election.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked **Atreyi Mitra** if she would like to accept the nomination.
		2. **Atreyi Mitra** accepted the nomination and excused herself from the room.
	4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the remaining committee members to develop questions to ask **Atreyi Mitra** pertaining to her potential role as Vice Chair.
	5. **Karen Rowe** stated that she was under the impression that the Vice Chair will attend the Council on Student Fees (CSF) meeting in January and if the Vice Chair will step in if the Chair is absent or unable to perform her duties. She asked if there was anything else the Vice Chair was response for beyond these responsibilities.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said this is an opportunity for the committee to develop additional duties for the Vice Chair role. For example, the Vice Chair could have more input on agenda items for the weekly meetings.
	6. **Karen Rowe** asked where **Nicole Corona Diaz** believes the Chair needs the most assistance. She also asked **Denise** **Marshall** how she provided assistance to the Chair in her former role as Vice Chair on last year’s SFAC committee.
		1. **Denise Marshall** said that her duties as Vice Chair included research for CSF meetings and summarizing information for the committee about what was happening during CSF meetings.
		2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** suggested that the Vice Chair could help plan the CSF meeting in January as it will be hosted by UCLA. The Vice Chair could also attend meetings with the Chair and Academic Planning and Budget (APB) Office. She said that the SFAC committee should be mindful that **Atreyi Mitra** may be the only person returning to the committee next year, so her potential role as Vice Chair could also serve as a training opportunity.
	7. **Karen Rowe** said that the committee could ask questions that are similar to those that the committee typically asks nominees for the Chair position. The committee could ask questions surrounding shared governance; for example, a question could ask how she understands the relationship between SFAC committee, Chancellor’s office, and the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (VCSA) office.
	8. **Nicole Corona Diaz** clarified that even if **Atreyi Mitra** is the only eligible committee member for the Chair position on next year’s SFAC committee, there will still need to be an election in the Spring.
	9. **Karen Rowe** suggested that the committee ask **Atreyi Mitra** about her prior experience, skills, and committee work that she feels will help her fulfill the role of Vice Chair? What issues does she see this committee facing this year? How does she strategize and think about the current budget crisis? Does she have any major conflicts of interest and how might they affect her ability to serve as the Vice Chair?
	10. **Atreyi Mitra** returned to the room to state her position and address questions from the committee.
	11. **Atreyi Mitra** stated that her pronouns are she/her/hers, she is a third-year student double-majoring in Human Biology and Society and Public Affairs. She wanted to thank the committee for the nomination and support thus far. She said that the reason that she wants to serve on SFAC was her experience last year advocating for the Campus Assault Resources and Education (CARE) office. As someone who is very involved in survivor advocacy spaces, she was aware that the office was understaffed, under-resourced, and underfunded. From 2017-18, just two CARE advocates saw 707 clients. That was disturbing to learn as somebody who understands trauma and how hard it can be to take on trauma as an advocate. As a result, she started taking notes, met with survivor advocates across the UC, formed a close relationship with the former UCLA CARE Director, reached out to other CARE Directors across the UC, and reached out to sexual violence activists with the intention of better understanding how CARE is funded. Throughout this process, she encountered several layers of bureaucracy. Serving on SFAC is very important to her because she wants to be in a space that ensures that student voices and priorities are heard. She wants to ensure that the committee is providing funding and resources for those critical student services. She wants to ensure that those students advocating for marginalized communities on campus are uplifted. She wants to make her best effort to help understaffed and underfunded programs on campus as much as possible; even though the committee may be working with a limited budget, the SFAC recommendations are a direct line to the Chancellor to show where student priorities lie. Lastly, she believes the best ways that she can be an activist is to support those who work with marginalized student communities; because these programs do so much for students, she wants to ensure that she does as much as she can to support them.
	12. **Paulina Macias** asked, “What are the major issues that you see facing the committee in the coming year?”
		1. **Atreyi Mitra** said that she believes the small budget that the committee has to work with will be a major challenge. While most committee members came to SFAC because they want to advocate, but may now feel daunted by the limited funding. She said that the committee needs to understand how to use this very small budget to maximize services and resources to students. She said that she wants students to get their “bang for their buck” on their SSF. She added that she wants to center marginalized voices because while there are competing priorities, it will be more and more difficult to do so with low fund pool.
	13. **Carina Salazar** asked, “What skills or experience do you bring to the position?”
		1. **Atreyi Mitra** said that she loves student journalism, she loves UCLA, and loves being informed as to what is going on. She said that reading the Daily Bruin helps her stay informed about campus happenings from the student perspective. She said that she heard about the SFAC committee through her advocacy work with CARE. As a result, before joining the committee as a student representative, she had already started to familiarize herself with how funding functions at UCLA for Student Affairs departments.
	14. **Karen Rowe** asked, “What is your understanding of shared governance? How do you envision your relationship with the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs?”
		1. **Atreyi Mitra** said that when considering shared governance, it is important everyone understands that we all have a seat at the table and that we need to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to voice their opinions and express their feelings on issues without fear of backlash.
		2. **Atreyi Mitra** said that it can be easy to be frustrated with a small budget. If we cannot recommend large amounts of funding, we can at least convey priorities on campus to the Chancellor’s office.
	15. **Kevin Kilgore** asked, “Do you have any conflicts of interest if you were to assume the position as Vice Chair?”
		1. **Atreyi Mitra** said she has a close connection with the CARE office, but she does not work for them. She also said that she doesn’t necessarily think CARE should be getting additional funding because they have recently hired two additional advocates. She is willing to step out of conversations surrounding CARE if needed, but she reiterated that she doesn’t think the office needs more funding. There are no other conflicts that she could think of.
	16. **Denise Marshall** asked, “What is your understanding of the budget crisis?”
		1. **Atreyi Mitra** said her understanding is limited. She said that she admits that when **Ellen Hermann** presented information about the budget crisis to the SFAC committee, she was confused. However, her general understanding is that the committee is severely limited their budget this year, especially in comparison to previous years. She feels that she has a lot left to learn, but she is also comfortable asking **Nicole Corona Diaz** to collaborate and clarify items that she does not understand.
	17. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee if there were any additional questions. With no additional questions**, Atreyi Mitra** left the room.
	18. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that **Atreyi Mitra** is an exceptional student given all of the work that she has done without holding a formal title or position. It is often the case that students wait until they hold a position and then start the work. She said that **Atreyi Mitra** is so remarkable in that she has so much tenacity and willingness to learn. She finds a way to get things done, even with hurdles in front of her. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that she believes this position will be a great opportunity for her to continue to grow and giving her this Vice Chair title will give her a position to continue her advocacy work.
	19. **Atreyi Mitra** returned to the room for the anonymous vote.
	20. The voting members of the committee conducted an anonymous vote. **Christine Wilson** recorded with 9 votes to approve, 0 abstained, the election of **Atreyi Mitra** as Vice Chair was approved by consent.
6. **Approval of UCSA Fees Invoice and Payment**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the floor to discuss the approval of UCSA (University of California Student Association) Fees invoice and payment. She clarified that these fees are the dues that are paid each year to CSF. CSF holds a meeting each quarter and once during the summer in which all SFAC Chairs from the UC campuses are invited to join. During these meetings, student representatives discuss the state budget and potential fee increases. The Chair of CSF has budget consultation meetings with UCOP and UCSA and information from those meetings gets funneled down through CSF to individual SFAC committees.
	2. **Atreyi Mitra** asked why the provided invoice shows that these fees are paid to UCSA.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** clarified that CSF is for student fees. The staff advisor for CSF happens to work on both CSF and UCSA. Although the invoice appears to show UCSA receives payment, these fees will be paid to CSF.
	3. **Carina Salazar** asked if these fees from CSF ever change.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that these fees could increase or decrease from year to year.
	4. **Karen Rowe** motioned to approve the payment of the invoice for UCLA membership on the CSF committee, **Denise Marshall** seconded. With no objections, the motion was approved by unanimous consent.
	5. **Karen Rowe** asked if the Chair of CSF sits as a student member on subcommittees that consider student fees.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that although the Chair has regularly scheduled calls, they do not sit on the subcommittee that considers student fees. The current CSF Chair directly consults with is the cohort-based tuition model committee and invites them to report information to CSF. **Jazz Kiang,** last year’s SFAC Chair, and another undergraduate student at UCLA sit on the cohort committee.
		2. **Karen Rowe** asked if there is a separate committee considering the increase in Student Services Fees (SSF).
		3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that she was not aware of such a committee. The CSF Chair mentioned a potential SSF increase as the recent CSF meeting, but no one has confirmed that increase at this time.
		4. **Karen Rowe** asked if CSF should advocate for student representatives on subcommittees that discuss SSF.
		5. **Atreyi Mitra** said that many students have advocated for student representation on subcommittees for the past few decades. However, there are only two students who sit on these committees with Regents. These student representatives include the Student Regent, **Hayley Weddle**, who is a voting member and the Student Regent-Designate, who is not a voting member. While the Student Regent and Student Regent-Designate may sit on some subcommittees, other students have the opportunity to take on Student Observer positions.
	6. **Atreyi Mitra** said that she attended a meeting in which the Chair of the Academic Senate stated that if the cohort-based tuition model is not introduced as an action item in the November Regents meeting, it is unlikely that it will be implemented by Fall 2020.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that CSF is considering the position of not making the cohort-based tuition model an action item in the November Regents meeting because such a change may be too soon; there are several unanswered questions that remain and there has not been a great deal of student consultation in the matter.
7. **Approval of Proposed Amendments to the SFAC Charter**
	1. **Karen Rowe** asked if the appointing body is already in the process of appointing a new SFAC Committee Member to fill the vacancy created by **Eliza Franklin-Edmonson.**
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that the Graduate Student Association (GSA) President, **Zac Fisher**, is aware of the newly vacated Graduate Student Representative position on the SFAC committee and has started the process of finding a replacement. The process of appointing a new committee member will take several weeks.
	2. **Karen Rowe** motioned to approve the proposed amendment to the SFAC Charter. **Atreyi Mitra** seconded**. Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the floor to discuss approval of proposed amendments to the SFAC Charter.
	3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** reviewed the proposed amendment language, which stated:

“In the case of an undergraduate transfer student who is ineligible to serve for two years, the student may be appointed for a one year term; if this student’s eligibility changes, they shall carry out their second year on the committee. If the student’s eligibility does not change, USAC shall appoint a one year appointment to carry out the remainder of the two year term.”

* 1. **Atreyi Mitra** asked whether or not committee should consider adding language to this amendment to include Graduate students in one-year programs given concerns that were raised in previous SFAC meetings.
		1. **Janay Williams** said that she believes that the committee decided to wait to change charter language to include Graduate students until a specific issue of Graduate students arises. It is not necessarily the best idea to change charter language until an issue presents itself.
		2. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** does not agree with the idea of waiting for a situation to present itself. That logic assumes that external groups will know that they can advocate for this change to charter language rather than the SFAC committee making this change to include Graduate students proactively. Her recommendation is to include Graduate students in one-year programs in the amendment language, but she stated that she is aware that there were concerns from the SFAC committee about appointment dates for these students.
		3. **Janay Williams** said that a graduate student in a one-year program would not be an enrolled student until after the committee has convened for the fall. Therefore, the student would need to apply to join this committee after the start of the Fall quarter. This differs from a transfer student who has been here for a year and could apply to join the committee and be appointed before the first Fall quarter meeting.
		4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** clarified that the proposed amendment language is concerned with eligibility. If an incoming transfer student does a summer program, for example, they would be eligible to apply to join the SFAC committee and join the committee before the first Fall quarter meeting.
		5. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** said that the committee should also consider the case of two-year Masters programs. Those students may be in situations that are similar to those of transfer students because if Graduate students in two-year programs do not have institutional knowledge coming into their program (and can apply before their first year in their program), they will not be able to apply to join the SFAC committee and serve a two-year appointment. She added that this seems like just as much of a disservice to these students as it is a disservice to transfer students.
	2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** added that this amendment does not close the door for discussion about additional amendments for Graduate students in the future. There is always time to include Graduate student language in the future; however, in order to have these types of discussions, the SFAC committee needs to move more swiftly in meetings. This particular situation with the transfer student is happening now and is more of an urgent matter.
	3. A **non-member of the committee** said that as an incoming transfer student, they did not have institutional knowledge about the SFAC committee. They suggested that this is an issue of advocacy and outreach; perhaps, the committee and other administrators need to work to ensure that incoming students are aware of SFAC committee opportunities.
		1. **Karen Rowe** said that new transfer student orientation should incorporate aspect of student governance. Early knowledge and messaging for incoming transfer students should invite them to apply to SFAC and other committees.
	4. **Janay Williams** said that she is concerned about the Graduate student amendment language and asked that the committee revisit that part of the amendment language next week and ensure that it is on next week’s agenda.
	5. **Karen Rowe** called the question. There were 8 votes to approve, 1 vote against, and no votes abstain. The motion to approve the proposed amendments to the SFAC charter passes. The approved language will be submitted to Chancellor.
1. **Discussion of Call Letter and Unit Review Timeline**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the floor to discuss Call Letter and Unit Review Timeline. She added that the committee needs to decide if they will send both the Call Letter and the Unit Review to units at the same time. If so, when will the committee send these items out. The committee also needs to finalize language in these documents.
		1. **Kevin Kilgore** asked if there was a benefit to sending the Call Letter and Unit Review at different times.
		2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that the in the past, it seems to have been helpful for the committee to review unit responses to both documents simultaneously. Sending them both out together and having both to review at the same time allows committee members to compare them.
		3. **Kevin Kilgore** stated that if these two documents correspond with one another, the it makes sense to send them at the same time.
		4. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** asked to confirm that the documents are in fact complimentary and are not simply duplicating information.
		5. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated it will depend on what is written in the Call Letter. However, the committee can check for redundancy and repetition in the language of both documents.
		6. **Janay Williams** reminded the committee that the Unit Review document is shorter and that the Call Letter is longer. The committee needs to ensure that they have prepared these documents appropriately. It might be easier to send out the Unit Review first and spend more time on solidifying the Call Letter.
	2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee to consider finalizing a deadline to send these documents out to units.
		1. **Ellen Hermann** advised that the committee first finalize and clarify their Unit Review process. For example, does the committee want units to come in to present at SFAC meetings? If so, then the committee should consider sending Unit Review requests as early as possible in order to give units time to prepare.
		2. **Karen Rowe** stated that both documents were due on November 29th last year and that the deadline should be no later than that this year. She added that the committee cannot ask units to submit Unit Reviews within a couple of weeks. Also, the committee should be clearer with what can and cannot be funded by this year’s funding. The SFAC committee should look at big funding commitments.
			1. **Ellen Hermann** suggested that the committee plans to receive large funding requests, even if the committee updates document language to clarify the current budget constraints. APB can provide a general ballpark estimate of “big funding commitments,” but the committee will need to decide which items are priorities.
		3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that she believes it is important to give student SFAC committee members the opportunity to provide more input on these matters. Call Letter language needs further discussion, but the Unit Review seems to be closer to finalized language.
			1. **Ellen Hermann** asked the committee to clarify their intended process and if that process includes unit presentations. The committee should consider the process in formulating the timeline for the Call Letter and Unit Review documents.
			2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** reminded the committee that every unit was invited to come in to present to the SFAC committee last year. However, this year’s committee can adjust this process.
			3. **Janay Williams** suggested that the committee does not invite units to present**.** She added that if a particular unit requests a large amount of funding, perhaps the committee can invite that unit in to an SFAC meeting so that committee members can clarify the current funding constraints.
			4. **Kevin Kilgore** agreed with **Janay Williams**. He stated that perhaps none of the units should be asked to come in so that the committee has a more objective approach to this process.
			5. **Karen Rowe** said that the questions raised during unit presentations can help produce thoughtful and helpful discussion. These presentations allow the committee members to challenge the information that the units present on paper.
			6. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that if the committee does not bring any units in, it will allow the committee to redistribute time in weekly committee meetings.
		4. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** stated that given the current budget constraints, she would like to prioritize time for committee discussion rather than hearing from units in presentations, especially if those presentations provide information that might not necessarily make difficult funding decisions any easier. She added that there appears to be differences of opinion amongst committee members as to what type of information should be gathered from units and how that information may or may not be helpful in decision making. At times, it seems as though it is difficult for the committee to find common ground because some members of the committee with historical knowledge have a certain perspective and some newer committee members have a different perspective. There appears to be a fundamental discord in regards to trust with units and how they are providing accurate information to the SFAC committee.
			1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked if **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** could provide anexample of how she might envision the committee moving forward in better and more productive way to be inclusive of both returning and new committee members?
			2. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** said that there appears to be a recurring narrative about what has happened in previous years on SFAC committees and that SFAC committee processes from previous years should dictate how things happen moving forward. She said that she would like for the committee to think differently about the process moving forward and to ensure that everyone on the committee feels empowered and has input as to what happens.
			3. **Janay Williams** stated that the previous SFAC committee that she served on operated much differently compared to what she is experiencing now. She believes that processes change from year to year. She added that she thinks that this year’s committee is in a peculiar predicament this year without funding and conversations need to be substantive. If the committee invites units in, these invitations need to be specific and intentional for unique situations. The committee should notify that they may be called in to address specific questions.
			4. **Nicole Corona Diaz s**aid that tries to include information from her experience on last year’s SFAC committee in order to help things run smoothly during committee meetings this year. However, the circumstances this year are different and things need to change. She asked that committee members speak up about the change that they would like to see this year.
		5. **Karen Rowe** reminded the committee that she is unsure whether the committee should or should not put out a Call Letter. She would like an analysis for where the money has gone and she is aware that the committee has tough decisions moving forward. She added that calling for proposals may give units an impression that the committee has more funding to consider than they actually do.
			1. **Kevin Kilgore** said that the committee has decided in previous meetings that the Call Letter will address this year's budget crisis. He added that not sending out a Call Letter sets a bad precedent and gives units a feeling of instability. The committee needs to move forward and needs to make decisions.
			2. **Ellen Hermann** reminded the committee that the Chancellor takes SFAC recommendations as an indication of the priorities on campus. If the committee does not allow units to submit requests and committee recommendations are not made, these programs are not put in front of the Chancellor. She added that it is important that the committee keeps this in mind in the Call Letter and is clear about what units can and cannot request. For example, if the committee does not allow new ideas, then the new ideas might not be brought to the Chancellor’s attention.
				1. **Janay Williams** asked **Ellen Hermann** what she suggests the committee should include in the Call Letter.
				2. **Ellen Hermann** said that at a minimum, the committee should put out a dollar amount in the Call Letter, potentially $2 million or lower. The committee does not need to do things in the same way, but a lot of what it will come down to this year is where are the priorities.
		6. **Kevin Kilgore** encouraged student committee members to be the loudest voice during committee meetings. Staff and faculty are a supplement to student representatives and should be a positive guidance. He added that students should consider putting themselves in the units’ position to better understand the impact of committee decisions.
		7. **Atreyi Mitra** agreed with **Ellen Hermann** that the committee’s recommendations can show the Chancellor that the committee does have priorities, even given the challenges of small budget.
		8. **Karen Rowe** said that she is concerned about Call Letter stating a specific budget because she believes that every unit will still come back with a large request and will not adjust their budgeting, staffing, etc.
			1. **Kevin Kilgore** added that the committee should expect large asks from units.
			2. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** stated that although these decisions are difficult, it is the SFAC committee’s job to make them. It is not the committee’s job to make units prepare differently for varying levels of funding. The committee cannot force the units to act in any particular way to prepare for windfalls or limited funding.
	3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that the committee needs to decide on a timeline. There will be a Call Letter going out and the committee can be specific in the language, but the committee does need to determine those deadlines.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that the Call Letter will be a longer discussion. With this information, the committee needs to decide if the Unit Review should be sent separately. If the Call Letter and the Unit Review are sent together, the committee could send both out by week five.
		2. **Kevin Kilgore** asked when the committee needs to make final recommendation decisions.
			1. **Ellen Hermann** reminded the committee that recommendations should be sent to the Chancellor by June 1. However, the earlier recommendations are submitted, the earlier that the Chancellor can respond.
			2. **Kevin Kilgore** suggested, given this information, that the committee should aim to have their recommendations to the Chancellor finalized by Friday May 22nd.
		3. **Kevin Kilgore** asked how long the committee needs to review responses from units.
			1. **Christine Wilson** said that this year could be different because generally, even when there is not a lot of temporary money available, the Call Letter and Unit Review may take some time (e.g. two weeks) to get distributed to individual units.
			2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that the committee ideally has two quarters to review, counting backwards from May 22nd, that requires a deadline for units to respond by at least December.
			3. **Ellen Hermann** asked the committee if they planned to review submissions over Winter Break. If not, it may be worth considering a deadline after the break is over in January.
			4. **Christine Wilson** reminded the committee that staff on campus work for approximately ten days after the end of finals week in December. This can be valuable time for units to work on their responses.
			5. **Kevin Kilgore** suggested a deadline of January 10th.
		4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that the way subcommittees functioned last year did not help the committee in creating a realistic budget. This year, instead of breaking out in subcommittees, the committee could focus more time on collective discussions.
			1. **Paulina Macias** stated that subcommittee work was redundant last year because the entire committee repeated the review process that subcommittees had already done on their own. However, subcommittees are helpful to summarize information that the entire committee can then review.
		5. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked for committee feedback on the deadline to send out the Call Letter. She asked, if January 10th is the deadline for units to respond, when the committee wants to send out the Call Letter.
			1. **Karen Rowe** reminded the committee the many of the units have responded to these questions in previous years and borrow language from previous submissions.
			2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked if November 19th was a reasonable deadline to send all of the documents out.
				1. **Christine Wilson** suggested that the committee send items out earlier because sometimes there is a delay before the Call Letter reaches the unit.
				2. **Kevin Kilgore** suggested November 8th.
			3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said the SFAC committee will aim to submit these documents by the end of week six.
		6. **Karen Rowe** requested that the committee discusses the Unit Review questions to consider reviewing permanently allocated funds during next week’s meeting.
2. **SSF Funding Priorities Discussion**
	1. **N/A**
3. **Finalize Unit Review Questions**
	1. **N/A**
4. **Announcements**
	1. **N/A**
5. **Adjournment**
	1. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** moved to adjourn the meeting**. Paulina** seconded. With no objections, **Nicole Corona Diaz** adjourned the meeting at 6:33 pm.