**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

**Murphy Hall Room 2206 from 4:30-6:30pm**

**Tuesday, November 5, 2019**

**Present:**

Graduates: Janay Williams, Brittnee Meitzenheimer, Denise Marshall

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

Administration: Carina Salazar, Associate Director, Career Center, Kevin Kilgore, Police Lieutenant, UCPD, Deb Geller, Associate Dean of Students

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:**

N/A

**Call to Order**

* 1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** called the meeting to order at 4:41pm.

1. **Approval of the Agenda**
   1. **Kevin Kilgore** moved to approve the agenda. **Denise Marshall** seconded. With no objections, the agenda was approved by consent.
2. **Review of Handouts**
   1. N/A
3. **Approval of Minutes** 
   1. **Kevin Kilgore** moved to approve minutes from 10.1.19. **Karen Rowe** seconded. With no objections, the minutes from 10.1.19 were approved.
   2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that approval for minutes from 10.22.19 would be tabled because some edits were still being received and the final version was not ready for approval.
4. **Approval and Discussion of Call Letter** 
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that there is an updated version of the Call Letter on Box now. That document is missing the additional guidelines that were discussed at last week’s meeting, but she said that she will follow up with **Ellen Hermann** about it. She then asked the committee to review the draft that was provided.
   2. The committee reviewed the statement “The committee is not aware of an increase to SSF level for the 2020-2021 fiscal year, thus we are making our 2021-2022 recommendations with the assumption that there will be no SSF increase. SFAC has determined that it can recommend between $1.6m and $2m in temporary funding in total for 2020-2021 and 2021-2022. Although the committee will prioritize funding recommendations for 2021-2022, in exceptional circumstances we may consider recommending funding for 2020-2021 to those items that received one year funds for 2019-2020. Please keep in mind that the total amount of temporary SSF funds allocated for 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 will be less than 25% of the total temporary SSF funds allocated for 2019-2020 and 2020-2021.”
      1. **Kevin Kilgore** asked to clarify if this was referring to academic or fiscal years.
         1. **Christine Wilson** clarified that this was referring to fiscal years.
      2. **Atreyi Mitra** asked to add “currently” to “not aware” in the first sentence because by the time that the Regents meeting happens, this may change.
      3. **Deb Geller** asked if the situation is really that we are not “aware of” an increase in funding or is it that we are not “anticipating any” increases in funding.
         1. **Ellen Hermann** suggested using “not anticipating” or “as of now, it has not been approved.”
   3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee to review the part of the draft relevant to the areas of interest for the committee. “As accustomed in previous years, SFAC has discussed and agreed to consider areas of interest for SSF funds. The following list will be consulted during SFAC’s deliberation: Programs and services currently funded by SSF funds that data proves to have been effective by providing direct services to students ; Programs and services that address challenges experienced by students from underserved, low-income and non-traditional backgrounds; Innovative programs that enhance students’ leadership and professional development for career aspirations; Cross-campus collaborative efforts that maximize efficient usage of funding, minimize duplicative services, and include cost-saving measures; Preventative efforts and or other holistic areas of student wellness that reduce influx to clinical mental health services”
      1. **Atreyi Mitra** said that she would like to discuss the last point, which referred to preventative efforts and mental health. Specifically, she would like to know what the committee’s stance is ono this issue; is it better to invest in current programs or new ways to help student well-being that haven’t been evaluated yet.
      2. **Christine Wilson** said this is a question worth further investigation. If you talk to Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS), they seriously reevaluated who they are and what their purpose is. Are they the neighborhood mental health clinic? Are they a full-service mental health hospital? She added that she thinks that they decided that the people who get paid lots of money to provide service should be devoted to providing services to people who need it at that level. There are other interventions that are more cost-effective, appropriate, and preventative in nature. You will only get the answer to your question by talking to CAPS and discussing their response amongst yourselves.
      3. **Atreyi Mitra** said that there are preventative efforts on campus (The Grand Depression Challenge, RISE, etc.) and they are great, but at the same time, the general lack of awareness of those services limits their capacity to help students. It’s great to have preventative efforts, but if no one knows about them, then students will keep going to CAPS and people will keep saying that it’s underfunded, under-resourced, and understaffed. What good are having these sort of preventative efforts then. If these trained clinicians at CAPS are able to provide services in ways that are good and trauma-informed, would it be potentially better to put funding to those who are already doing good work and are underfunded. She added that this does not mean that she doesn’t think that money should be put towards preventative efforts, she just does not know to what extent students will benefit from preventative efforts if they don’t know about them.
         1. **Karen Rowe** said that she thinks that part of the intent last year when they discussed this issue, that there should be a broader network of services so that students would know. She added that the committee has not received any information on reconceptualization of CAPS.
         2. **Christine Wilson** said happened reconceptualization happened before **Karen Rowe** was on SFAC. It was about their role, not necessarily their funding.
         3. **Karen Rowe** said that CAPS created a system of review so that incoming students would be categorized in terms of need. It didn’t mean that they were devoting all services to that, but they would determine whether a student needed to be seen immediately or whether they could have a four-week window to be scheduled for an appointment. They put in screeners which helped to reallocate resources. That didn’t mean that they were referring people to other services that are provided. For example, they wouldn’t necessarily be referring somebody back to CARE. Students will go to CARE and CARE staff is trained to recognize whether or not a student is in crisis and needs immediate intervention or could benefit from other services. The idea is that they could be thinking of those outlying entities as identifiers who could help be points of referral. The idea was to catch students before a crisis point. We were also concerned about the overreliance on CAPS and the central limits of their space. Over the last few years, there has been funding for clinicians positioned in specific departments (e.g. School of Law, LGBT). We need to think of ways to position counselors not in a central building, but people out in entities that are more approachable and serving various populations. There was a lot of thought about how to make this a campus-wide endeavor.
      4. **Christine Wilson** said that all of the decisions that have been made about different services that have been developed are research-driven and proven. For the committee to decide where that should happen without a full picture from CAPS would be a mistake. It isn’t the committee’s job to decide if the campus should provide preventative services or specific clinicians should be available. It’s outside of the realm of this committee’s capabilities to decide how mental health services should be structured.
      5. **Karen Rowe** said that that at orientation, she asked about whether or not there was a campus-wide committee that includes at all of the health professionals.
         1. **Atreyi Mitra** asked if **Karen Rowe** was aware of the CAPS oversight committee.
         2. **Karen Rowe** said that if that committee has been expanded to include others, that’s great, but at the orientations she understood that the campus still needs a cohesive plan to access mental health.
      6. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that she understood the root of **Atreyi Mitra**’s question to be about promotion of services and ensuring that every student is aware of them. The committee should be able to include that kind of information rather than telling units what they should or shouldn’t do.
         1. **Atreyi Mitra** clarified that she was referring to committee’s overall stance. She believes that mental health is such a big issue at UCLA and the committee needs to have some understanding of mental health.
      7. **Deb Geller** suggested using alternative language to include “primary, secondary, and tertiary mental health services.” That recognizes that mental health comes from a variety of places at a variety of levels. If we go back to 2006 when we got funding specifically designated for mental health, they used those three categories (primary, secondary, and tertiary). Primary meaning the clinical services and counseling and secondary/tertiary meaning the preventative services. That funded things like Bruin Resource Center and some of the counseling response team, with a specific mental health focus rather than holistic areas of wellness (which isn’t necessarily mental health prevention). That type of vague language made it so that any unit on campus could then say that they are a holistic wellness provider.
         1. **Atreyi Mitra** asked if **Deb Geller** could define secondary and tertiary in this context.
         2. **Christine Wilson** recommended that the committee members look up the “UCOP 2006 Student Mental Health report.” On page 11, there are definitions of secondary and tertiary.
         3. **Deb Geller** read these definitions in that document to the committee: primary is critical mental health service, secondary are targeted interventions for vulnerable groups, and tertiary are programs that create healthier learning environments. She added that if needed, the committee can define these in the letter for units who may not know them.
         4. **Kevin Kilgore** suggested that it may be easier to link to that page in the document that is sent to units.
         5. **Karen Rowe** asked to clarify that mental health and CAPS are funded by SSF funds. Those never hit this committee unless they come to us and say that they need additional money because of their union contract. That situation has happened in the past. The mental health is carved off before the SSF funds ever hit SFAC.
            1. **Christine Wilson** said it was the case last time, but in 2006 it was not.
            2. **Deb Geller** said that last year was the only year that it was carved off.
            3. **Ellen Hermann** said that she was under the impression that, in recent years, every year that there has been an increase, it has been carved off.
         6. **Deb Geller** said that she recalls last year’s committee sent a letter encouraging this in the future...
            1. **Ellen Hermann** said that the letter wasn’t specific. She added that last year, everyone had slightly different ideas about what constituted a mental health unit or program. She said that she does not feel comfortable deciding that.
            2. **Deb Geller** said she believed that **Jazz Kiang** sent a letter to the Chancellor in June about this.
            3. **Ellen Hermann** said yes, but it did not have any specifics.
            4. **Deb Geller** said that she believed the letter said that they should not give all funding to CAPS.
            5. **Ellen Hermann** said yes, but it did not specify where else to put the funding.
         7. **Atreyi Mitra** asked **Ellen Hermann** about when there is an increase in SSF levels, that she was under the impression that a certain percentage had to go to mental health services.
            1. **Ellen Hermann** said that in recent years, when there was an increase, half of the increase was supposed to go to mental health. That amount has gone to CAPS. Last year, there was a buyout. The buyout was not transferred as SSF funds, but because it was theoretically in lieu of the increase in fees, the campus decided that it would treat it as thought it was an increase in fees. So half went to the unallocated account that the committee makes recommendations out of and half went to mental health. Since there was no other specific place to put those funds, it went to CAPS.
         8. **Atreyi Mitra** said that she finds the idea of “secondary” particularly interesting. That in itself is potentially broadening the scope of mental health.
         9. **Ellen Hermann** said that she’s not sure that she feels comfortable recommending alternative units to send mental health funds. However, just as **Atreyi Mitra** mentioned, there are a lot of ways to broaden the scope of what is mental health. She thinks that is an interesting concept, but at the same time, she is not equipped to determine what the best approach to mental health should be. Since CAPS seems to want the funding, the campus has been sending it to them. She said that she opens it up to the committee to recommend where else it should go. She reminded the group that they are not mental health professionals either, so it would make sense to consult with other parties.
         10. **Carina Salazar** said that she does not believe that the committee is equipped to make that judgement call.
      8. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked if, in terms of this particular point, if defining primary, secondary, and tertiary is a direction that the committee would like to move towards. If so, do members want to simply list these in the point.
         1. **Kevin Kilgore** suggested that that there could be additional language stating “if you want to see a definition for (primary/secondary/tertiary), you can go to (link to a page).”
         2. **Ellen Hermann** said that they will send this document as a PDF and could add the link, but they could also write it out if it is a short URL.
         3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that they can add, “Primary (critical mental health services), secondary (targeted interventions for vulnerable groups) and tertiary (creating healthier learning environments) mental health services. For additional information regarding the definitions for each of these tiers, please reference [page 11 of the UCOP 2006 Student Mental Health Committee Report](https://www.ucop.edu/student-affairs/_files/student-mental-health-cmte-report2006.pdf)” as the last bullet point.
      9. **Karen Rowe** said that when last year’s committee was discussing this allocation and where they might recommend this funding, it was not necessarily that they were looking for new or untested services, they were looking at where they had funded before with temporary funds. They said that the possibilities were such that they could use the funding that was available and recommend to the Chancellor that these services that had been previously funded with SSF Funding that were proven. It was not as though they were operating in lieu of mental health professionals.
         1. **Atreyi Mitra** said she appreciated the clarification because it seemed as though they were suggesting untested services.
      10. **Christine Wilson** said that the Chancellor wrote back to last year’s SFAC chair and essentially said “as you may know [..] we employed this strategy over the past few years to bolster campus prevention efforts as well as provide greater support to counseling at CAPS by reducing the number of students seeking critical counseling services. While we need to continue our support of direct clinical counseling for students, I also support an equal focus of support for student resilience programs and I have asked Vice Chancellor Gorden to work closely with the committee to suggest the departments and programs for which SSF funding recommendations can be made.” While this is generally up to the committee, Vice Chancellor Gorden does oversee the majority of programs serving students and it is a good place to start.
          1. **Karen Row**e asked when the committee is supposed to hear from Vice Chancellor Gorden.
          2. **Christine Wilson** said that Vice Chancellor Gorden would generally wait to hear from the SFAC committee.
          3. **Karen Rowe** asked if in this letter, the Chancellor is saying that the funding would be available outside of the other allocations.
          4. **Christine Wilson** said that no. This is a part of a five year agreement made with Janet Napolitano. There isn’t a history; there have been two different mental health funding initiatives. The first was in 2006 (it came straight to the committee) and another was in 2015 (which didn’t come to this committee). She added that establishing how the committee feels about it could be something to think about. **Nicole Corona Diaz** would need to speak up to let Vice Chancellor Gorden know that this is something that the committee would like to discuss.
      11. **Atreyi Mitra** asked what were examples of cross-campus collaborations.
          1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that it depends. She recently spoke with AVC Suzanne Seplow, who provided examples of the ways in which certain programs could become singular programs. It would depend on if you see any duplication of services and department heads want to act on it. She added that it makes sense to encourage units to find these themselves. It wouldn’t make sense to put suggestions for certain units on this Call Letter.
          2. **Atreyi Mitra** asked what the benefits were to cross-campus collaborations.
             1. **Janay Williams** said that it generally equates to less money. If two people apply for separate funds for the same thing, it’s more
             2. **Karen Rowe** said that it previously applied with the Bruin Resource Center. For example, every sub-unit in the center had orientation, entertainment, etc. It made sense that some of those should be combined rather than paying for each sub-unit to do it separately. That was considered cross-collaborative with units.
      12. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee to discuss budget categories. Specifically, this list of categories is what units would input requests for in the spreadsheet templates. She asked if the committee wants to get specific and get rid of certain categories pr simply keep the list the same as last year. The categories listed were:

Salaries/Wages (Non-Student)

Benefits (Non-Student)

TIF (Non-Student)

Salaries/Wages (Student)

Benefits (Student)

TIF (Student)

Marketing/Promotional Materials

Food/Refreshments

Office Supplies/Equipment

Computer Software/Audio-Video Materials

Speaker Honorarium

Communication/Mail

Transportation

Facilities/Equipment Rental

Other

* + - 1. **Ellen Hermann** reminded the committee that if they remove certain categories, the units will not know if you are getting rid of it because you don’t want them to ask for those funds. This is if you want to see this level of detail broken down. They will put whatever you do not see here in the “Other.”
         1. **Karen Rowe** said that they could get rid of “other.” She does not think it is useful.
         2. **Ellen Hermann** said that the units would then write it elsewhere on their request. She said that she feels the committee needs some sort of catch-all for other unique things. They could take out “other,” but the units will just start to write things anyway.
      2. **Kevin Kilgore** asked if they had already decided that the first six categories were staying.
         1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that yes, that was her understanding.
      3. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** said that she understands that in previous years, the committee was choosing to not fund past the first six categories. However, from what she heard, some units would rather receive full funding for a particular item than partial funding for multiple things. With that in mind, it seems like it would be helpful to keep all categories, especially if the units could connect these categories to a single event. That would hopefully create a more holistic picture for the committee to review.
         1. **Ellen Hermann** said that hopefully units will clearly label how all of these things fit with a single event/program.
         2. **Janay Williams** said that she agrees with **Brittnee Meitzenheimer’s** point.
      4. **Atreyi Mitra** asked if any of the bills that Gov Gavin Newsom recently signed into law would affect funding for any of these items.
         1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that no, she was not aware of any, but that seems like a conversation perhaps for a different time.
         2. **Christine Wilson** reminded the committee that the state government does not technically control UC budget. The three part plan says that the government can indicate what the UCs, CSUs, CCCs do. It is theoretically the Regents who decide where the money goes. Governor can’t sign anything into law that would provide money to the UC all by himself.
         3. **Ellen Hermann** said that it may be helpful for Jeff to come in and discuss this with the committee.
      5. **Karen Rowe** said that during previous meetings this quarter, the committee had eliminated things that had to do with things that were eliminated in the final cuts from last year’s committee before final recommendations. To her memory, that included “Marketing/Promotional Materials”, “Food/Refreshments,” “Office Supplies/Equipment,” etc. She said when you open up all of the categories, then people will apply (particularly for “Food/Refreshments”). We will be asked to make judgements that we’ve tried to make before. Often these units haven’t given any indication as to what goes together mandatorily. It was frequently that the committee eliminated low priority items that the units indicated they could do without.
      6. **Kevin Kilgore** said that if the committee eliminates categories, units will still request those same funds in other remaining categories. Then, it becomes the duty of the committee to try to figure out which categories they should go in. If the categories are already there, then it is easier to have the units put them in the categories for the committee.
      7. **Deb Geller** said that if as a group, the committee decides that there are some categories that they are not open to funding, the committee should explicitly say which categories they won’t consider funding. One category that is missing on this list that she believes would add value is, “Travel/Professional Development.” They have received many requests for those types of items and it does not currently fit neatly into an existing category.
      8. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee members to think about if they want to (1) keep all categories as is with “Travel/Professional Development” added, (2) pick some categories to keep and delete others, or (3) explicitly list categories that they will not fund.
         1. Committee members indicate that they would prefer option 3.
      9. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee members to provide categories that they do not want to consider funding for.
         1. **Atreyi Mitra** said honorarium.

**Brittnee Meitzenheimer** asked if this meant that the committee wouldn’t consider small honorarium for local guests.

**Deb Geller** said that the committee is saying that UCLA has resources. If units can tap into people who are here and already receiving salary, they should invite those guests to speak instead. If units need an expert that does not work on campus, they will need to find other funding.

**Ellen Hermann** said that they may want to specify this as “non-student honorarium.”

**Christine Wilson** said that students are typically rewarded in other ways (e.g. money on their BruinCard).

**Ellen Hermann** said that for students working on “This is Bruin Life” it is typically listed as “wages.”

**Atreyi Mitra** asked to clarify why the committee was allowed to give stipends to students performing in the “This is Bruin Life” production.

**Deb Geller** said that youcan hire an employee and treat them as student salaries. Stipends are often paid as student salaries. Honorarium are typically paid as consultants through accounts payable.

* + - * 1. **Karen Rowe** said that the committee has routinely not funded “Travel/Professional Development” when it applies to staff traveling to conferences or professional development seminars. Some of the thinking was that we all need to have professional development, but it is part of your job. There are professional development things handled by Human Resources or that administrators need to do as a function of their job.

**Atreyi Mitra** said that maybe what **Karen Rowe** is talking about i**s** something like what’s offered by the Graduate Student Resource Center

**Ellen Hermann** said that she thinks **Atreyi** Mitra and **Karen Rowe** are thinking about two separate items, staff vs. student professional development. Also, whether or not the committee decides to fund staff professional development, there are costs associated with it.

**Karen Rowe** says that costs associated with hiring and training an employee for professional development isn’t something that SFAC should fund.

**Deb Geller** said if SFAC is funding the position, and does not fund professional development, then that person won’t have had those opportunities to keep current and meet the needs of a changing student population. If we are the only funding source for the position, it may not be feasible to ask them to get professional development elsewhere. She would be more supportive if the committee said we wouldn’t provide it for career staff, but only in situations when somebody is asking for salary through SFAC funds.

**Karen Rowe** asked if professional development is included in TIF?

**Ellen Hermann** said that professional development is not included in TIF. Whether or not Student Affairs includes professional development in infrastructure seems more unclear.

**Karen Rowe** said that the committee saw requests for travel across the country for professional development.

**Ellen Hermann** said that she can break out travel as well.

**Karen Rowe** said that she feels strongly that professional development is the responsibility of the position itself. They should instead take care of local professional development opportunities. We cover the students in situations like group trainings or weekend retreats. That contributes to their professional development. She added that sometimes the committee has to make close or difficult calls, but it has been something that the committee has almost entirely eliminated funding in the past.

* 1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked committee to read through Unit Review Questions.
     1. **Deb Geller** said that it may not make sense to indicate a word count for an organizational chart as is suggested in the question: “Please provide an organizational chart of your campus entity. This chart should include which positions are career, contract, or student, and whether each position is funded by SSF or another source. For the contract positions funded by SSF, indicate how long the incumbent has been in this position. For student positions, indicate whether you utilize work-study funding. “
        1. **Karen Rowe** said that some units describe organization in detail, so the word count might be helpful
        2. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** suggested that they could bold the word “chart” to clarify what they are looking for.
     2. **Kevin Kilgore** said that you could remove “overall” on question: “Please review the attached “SSF Actual Trend Report” for your campus entity. Explain any changes in overall revenue, overall compensation, and overall expenditures. Provide a break out of other revenue sources including grants, Office of the Chancellor funds, sponsorships, sales and service etc. with their respective amounts. (200 words max).”
        1. **Deb Geller** asked what “Office of the Chancellor funds” were.
           1. **Ellen Hermann** suggested calling them “chancellorial”, or if you are referring to general funds, you should add “general funds” as well. It depends on what you are specifically asking about.
           2. **Karen Rowe** said that some entities indicate that they have funding directly from the Chancellor.
           3. **Ellen Hermann** would recommend that they are called “chancellorial funds” then.
           4. **Deb Geller** said that it feels as though state general funds should be mentioned here as that is the other primary “other” funding source.
           5. **Ellen Hermann** said that if that is all that they are getting at, then just “general funds” would suffice.
           6. **Karen Rowe** said it was both in some cases.
           7. **Ellen Hermann** said that there would be overlap in many cases. She is not sure what exactly the committee is hoping to receive from units.
           8. **Deb Geller** could say including “gifts, grants, sponsorships, sale and service funds, and any other university funding sources.”
        2. **Christine Wilson** asked what the committee was hoping to receive in terms of a response from this.
           1. **Ellen Hermann** asked what the committee was planning to do with this response.
           2. **Christine Wilson** provided an example of if she said that her unit had a sales and service account that brought in $800K, what would the committee do with that information.

**Karen Rowe** said that last year, they would do a lot with that information.

**Ellen Hermann** said that she did not believe that the committee got this information last year.

* + - * 1. **Ellen Hermann** is concerned about the quality of information that would be in a response to this question. Information might be inconsistent.
        2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that the reason for this question was that the committee wanted to get a better sense of the revenue that each unit has.
      1. **Ellen Hermann** said that many units that they will ask will have a lot of these sources of funding. In a lot of cases, they also have a lot of other activities that they are doing with that funding. It is not SFAC’s purview to comment on those activities. She asked how the committee plans to use the answers that they would get to this question. If you receive an answer, it will only be the revenue side, not the expense side.
         1. **Karen Rowe** said that it came up specifically in the proposal from the Dashew Center.
         2. **Ellen Hermann** said that she understands that some units may have balances in general funds that they may be able to apply to some activities that are currently funded by SFAC. She does not know that you’re going to get the right information from this question.
         3. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** said that if there is a specific concern about a specific situation, the committee can ask a specific question as opposed to blanket asking for information that may or may not provide enough helpful information.
         4. **Karen Rowe** said that this question has always included a box.

**Ellen Hermann** asked if that box has been helpful.

**Karen Rowe** said that yes. It was helpful. When trend reports are substituted, the trend reports do not get at other sources of funding.

* + - 1. **Christine Wilson** said that as an advisor, trying to keep the committee’s role where it should be and the work manageable, she would again bring up the example of her unit having $800K in sales and service. What would the committee do with this information. How would it influence what you did with the unit's SSF funding.
      2. **Deb Geller** said that the risk of seeing other funding sources with restrictions, you are inclined to assume that “you have this other money, you can use it for these things.” However, getting other fund sources and amounts without the other restrictions that go with them, has some inherent risk. She said that while some answers are interesting, she is not sure how it is useful.
         1. **Ellen Hermann** said that she can run reports if these are the questions that people have, but she is not sure it’s helpful.
         2. **Deb Geller** said that sometimes it is not the budget-related staff who work on these unit reviews.
         3. **Ellen Hermann** said that sometimes it is unclear to people-are they asking about the entire unit? A specific program? There is a lot of room for interpretation.
      3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that the committee needs to vote on this question – should they keep the second sentence “Provide a break out of other revenue sources including grants, general funds, Chancellorial funds, sponsorships, sales and service etc. with their respective amounts. (200 words max).” or not.
         1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** moved to vote to include the “Provide a break out of other revenue sources including grants, general funds, Chancellorial funds, sponsorships, sales and service etc. with their respective amounts. (200 words max).” **Deb Geller** seconded.
         2. **Deb Geller** called to question. **Brittnee Meitzenheime**r seconded. 5 votes were recorded for yes, 1 vote was recorded for no. No one abstained. The committee voted to call to question by consent.

**Nicole Corona Diaz** recorded 2 votes to keep the statement, 5 votes to get rid of the statement, 1 vote to abstain. The committee voted to remove the statement that reads: “Provide a break out of other revenue sources including grants, general funds, Chancellorial funds, sponsorships, sales and service etc. with their respective amounts. (200 words max).”

* + 1. **Deb Geller** asked to review the question: “If applicable, why does your campus entity have carryforward SSF funds? What is your plan and timeline for utilizing this carryforward in line with the originally approved purpose? Given the trend reports that were made available to the committee are not completely accurate, please provide your unit’s carryforward amount to date. (200 words max.)”
       1. **Deb Geller** said that it may not be helpful to say ‘given the trend reports are not completely accurate.’
          1. **Ellen Hermann** said that sheagrees with **Deb Geller.** The trend reports match the ledger exactly. Perhaps the intention of this statement was that they do not necessarily align with how programs are broken out.
          2. **Deb Geller** suggested instead saying: “given the trend reports were prepared by department and not by program."
          3. **Ellen Hermann** asked if they meant that the trend reports were not current.
          4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that she believes they meant that they were not current.
          5. **Deb Geller** suggested adding“and were effective as of June 30, 2019. Please provide your unit’s updated or current carryforward balance.”
          6. **Ellen Hermann** cautioned the committee against judging too much on that because it will not include expenses for the year.
          7. **Karen Rowe** said that the committee had also requested that units comment on these.
          8. **Ellen Hermann** said that she does see an issue with the question, but she is unsure how the committee plans to use the data.
          9. **Karen Rowe** said that's exactly why the committee asks them to explain their carryforward. Some were detailed in their explanations and others were not.
       2. **Deb Geller** said that this does not reads as an ask. The committee needs to recognize this question may go with another question. Question five could read “attached you will find SSF actual trend report that was prepared for your campus entity. Please note that it was prepared by department, not by program and was effective June 30th, 2019. Explain any changes in overall revenue, overall compensation, and overall expenditures only on your unit’s trend report.” Then question six could be, “If your trend report reflected a carryforward balance of SSF funds on June 30th, 2019, please provide your plan and timeline for utilizing this carryforward and explain how that plan is consistent with the funds’ original purpose.”
          1. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** asked to clarify that **Deb** Geller was suggesting they join question five and six, then make it majority question five with question six being split into two pieces (part a and b).
          2. **Deb Geller** said yes, she likes that idea. So, it would be written as:

“Attached you will find an “SSF Actual Trend Report” for your campus entity. Please note that the trend reports were prepared by department and not by program and were effective as of June 30, 2019.

Explain any changes in overall revenue, compensation, and expenditures only as reflected in your unit’s trend report. (200 words max).

If applicable, why does your campus entity have carryforward SSF funds? What is your plan and timeline for utilizing this carryforward? How is this plan in line with the originally approved purpose? (200 words max.) ”

* + 1. **Deb Geller** motioned to approve the unit review as seen on the screen, **Kevin Kilgore** seconded. **Nicole Corona Diaz** recorded 7 votes to approve, 0 votes against, and 0 votes to abstain. The unit review questions as seen on the screen were approved by consent.

1. **Approval and Discussion of Student Service Fee Funding Questions**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked to review “2019 SFAC Funding Questionnaire”
   2. **Deb Geller** asked about “If this is a continuing request, discuss previous successes, student outcomes and discuss future plans. If this is a new request, provide a statement of need and explain why SSF funds should be used for this manner, as opposed to other existing programs/ initiatives/ positions.”
      1. **Deb Geller s**aid for the “as opposed to other existing programs/ initiatives/ positions” piece, she is not entirely sure what the committee was asking. Are they asking “why should we prioritize funding your proposal over a different program” or is the committee saying “why should SSF funds be used instead of another funding source.”
      2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that the first option that **Deb Geller** said was the correct interpretation.
      3. **Deb Geller said that it could then be changed to “**if this is a new request, please provide a statement of need and explain why SSF funds should be prioritized for this purpose.”
      4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** updated that question to read “If this is a continuing request, discuss previous successes, student outcomes and discuss future plans. If this is a new request, provide a statement of need and explain why SSF funds should be prioritized for this purpose.”
      5. **Deb Geller** suggested that they should rearrange questions to combine into: “
         1. If this is a continuing request:
            1. Discuss previous successes, student outcomes and discuss future plans.
            2. Explain why SFAC should continue supporting these items.
            3. What is your plan to sustain previously funded SSF services if we are unable to provide continuing funding, given the lack of funding for the 2021-2022 fiscal year?
         2. If this is a new request:
            1. Provide a statement of need.
            2. Explain why SSF funds should be prioritized for this purpose.
            3. Provide an implementation plan for the program/initiative/position. ”
      6. **Karen Rowe** asked if they wanted to add language asking the units about whether they are prioritizing the new request rather than prioritizing continuing programs.
      7. **Deb Geller** said that they could add a “d” part of the fourth question to allow units to indicate if this is a higher priority than continuing funding for existing programs.
      8. **Karen Rowe** asked why on the first question they including 2020-2021 on this form if the committee decided that they would only entertain offers for 2021-2022. Specifically referring to:
         1. “General Information:
            1. Organization/Department:
            2. Program/Initiative/Position Title:
            3. Continuing or New, Temporary Request:
            4. Aggregated request amount (s):

2020-2021:

2021-2022:

* + 1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that they already clarified that in the call letter language.
    2. **Ellen Hermann** suggested that they could add language to say that it is only for extraordinary circumstances.
    3. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** said that they could put “extraordinary” in parenthesis after 2020-2021. It would read:
       1. “2020-2021 (will only be considered in exceptional circumstances):”
  1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee to review the questions after suggested edits.
  2. **Karen Rowe** said if this is a supplemental proposal for one-time only allocations for 2020-2021, the committee needs to ask different questions because they need to be able to clearly articulate it. If the units put these types of requests under “this is a continuing request” is it a continuing request under 2021-22? If we’re asking about one-time supplemental proposals, those are different than either of these two question options.
     1. **Kevin Kilgore** said that in those cases the committee could go back and ask units for this information at that point.
     2. **Karen Rowe** said that she wants clarification up front and to not confuse units so that everyone is clear about what they’re applying for.
     3. **Kevin Kilgore** said that they could ask in parenthesis to indicate which year the request is in.
     4. **Christine Wilson** said that the year is labeled in the spreadsheet.
     5. **Karen Rowe** said that different departments will be confused by this.
     6. **Christine Wilson** said that she is not sure that the committee can do anything about that.
     7. **Karen Rowe** suggested that they say "if this is a supplemental proposal in exceptional circumstances, please explain in detail the funding requests.” Something that clarifies the years.
  3. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** motioned to vote. **Deb Geller** seconded.
     1. **Christine Wilson** asked the committee to allow **Nicole Corona Diaz** to make non-substantive grammatical changes.
     2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** recorded 6 votes to approve, 1 vote against, 1 abstain. The Student Service Fee Funding Questions while allowing **Nicole Corona Diaz** to make non-substantive grammatical changes was approved. Approved.
  4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked to quickly review the Call Letter.
     1. **Deb Geller** motioned to approve the Call Letter with the caveat that **Nicole Corona Diaz** can make non-substantive grammatical changes as necessary and to approve the spreadsheet attachment that will be provided by APB. **Kevin Kilgore** seconded.
     2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** recorded 8 votes to approve, 0 vote against, 0 abstain. Call Letter with the caveat that **Nicole Corona Diaz** can make non-substantive grammatical changes as necessary and to approve the spreadsheet attachment that will be provided by APB was approved.

1. **Discussion of Master Student Amendment to Charter** 
   1. **N/A**
2. **Announcements** 
   1. **N/A**
3. **Adjournment**
   1. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** moved to adjourn the meeting, **Atreyi Mitra** seconded**.** With no objections, **Nicole Corona Diaz** adjourned the meeting at 6:35pm.