STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

A-239 Murphy Hall

Thursday, October 24, 2013

**Attendees Present:**

Graduates: Alison Winje (Chair), Randy Mai, Theresa Stewart

Undergraduates: Moneel Chand, Jas Kirt, Janay Williams, Jazz Kiang

Administration: Christine Wilson, Director, GSRC

Maureen Wadleigh, Associate Director, CRA

Faculty: Kym Faull, Prof. in Residence

Ex-Officio: Rebecca Lee-Garcia, Academic Planning and Budget

Guest: Jazz Kiang, Undergraduate student

**Absent:** Annie Blomberg – Graduate representative

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m.

**Handouts:**

* Agenda for October 24 2013
* Minutes from October 17 2013
* SFAC Compensation Criteria
* 10/09/13 Approved revision fund #66201
* Optometry rate comparison
* Unit review letter to units, 2013

**Approval of Agenda:**

* A motion was made to approve the agenda. This vote was unanimous.

**Review of Minutes:**

* A motion was made by ***Kym Faull*** and seconded by ***Randy Mai*** to approve the 10/17/2013 minutes as amended. This vote was unanimous with one abstention.

**New User Fee Request:**

* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** reviewed the user fee policy with the committee, which applies only to voluntary fees charged to students enrolled at UCLA. SFAC will only receive applications for new fees, or increases to existing fees. If the fee increase is less than inflation, it will come to SFAC as an information item only.
* The committee reviewed the Ashe Center’s request to institute additional user fees for expanded services at their new optometry center. These fees are new because the services for which they would be charged are new.
* ***Alison Winje*** asked when the fees would go into effect if approved. ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** responded that they would go into effect immediately upon approval. ***Alison Winje*** asked if they had the capacity to offer these services in their current location, as the expanded location would not open until next year. ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** pointed out that this was not a fee increase, but rather additional fees for additional options such as different kinds of sunglasses, contacts, and lenses that the center would provide to customers.
* The committee discussed the sensitivity surrounding the campus offering services that are also offered in Westwood Village, especially in light of the new on-campus conference center.
* ***Kym Faull*** stated his support of the new fees for the expanded services and products. Jazz Kiang asked for clarification on whether the focus is on new products or the expansion to the new location. ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** clarified that SFAC is supposed to vote on whether or not they approve the new fees. The expansion is happening and has been funded.
* ***Maureen Wadleigh*** asked how they could know if these fees were a reasonable rate for students. ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** told the committee that the Ashe Center hired a consultant to come up with the numbers.
* ***Randy Mai*** stated his support of the new fees for the additional services and products. ***Janay Williams*** also stated her support.
* ***Kym Faull*** made a motion to approve the new fees. ***Randy Mai*** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.
* ***Alison Winje*** called for volunteers to write the letter to the Chancellor stating SFAC’s approval of the new fees. ***Moneel Chand*** will write the letter for the committee’s review.

**Merit Increase Discussion:**

* ***Randy Mai*** stated his full support of funding the increases related to staff on permanent funds, but his hesitation about funding staff on temporary funds, based on the budget projections provided by APB.
* ***Kym Faull*** reiterated that if the increases are not funded, that will be a budget cut to all units who have staff on temporary funds, reducing the services they provide. It was clarified that these merit increases have already been awarded, and now the funding must come from somewhere.
* ***Marilyn Alkin*** noted that having this discussion at this time of year is something of an anomaly. The previous year’s committee had approved benefits increases, but left merit increases to this year’s committee to give them some flexibility.
* ***Jazz Kiang*** felt that the timeline was forcing SFAC’s hand, as the increases have already been funded and it is clear the units do not have alternate plans to fund the increases.
* ***Jas Kirt*** said she would not feel comfortable not funding the increases, as these positions were funded by SFAC so it seems appropriate that they would fund the incremental costs associated with them.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** explained to the committee that the previous year’s committee recommended to fund benefits over the next two years. This SFAC has the option to fund for one year or two years.
* ***Kym Faull*** made a motion to approve all merit increases for two years (13/14 and 14/15) for positions funded by student service fee funds. ***Christine Wilson*** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**Compensation Policy Letter:**

* ***Alison Winje*** informed the committee of the plan to send surveys to currently compensated committees to determine commonalities between them that could be used as criteria to determine whether or not compensation for a future committee is justified.
* ***Theresa Stewart*** asked what kind of other on campus committees would apply to receive compensation. SACBOG, CRC, JWCBOG, and other student majority committees might apply for compensation. ***Jas Kirt*** clarified that these committees have not requested compensation, but SFAC is creating a process by which compensation could be requested.
* The need for quantifiable, numerical guidelines and criteria was discussed by the committee. ***Alison Winje*** distributed the application/survey as it would look if SFAC filled it out. Amount of hours worked was cited as one quantifiable criterion. ***Alison Winje*** explained that while SFAC may not work as many hours as some of the other committees, they do handle a much larger budget, so size of budget and scope of responsibility should be considered as another criterion.
* ***Jas Kirt*** reviewed the 3 criteria created by a previous committee member; time required for participation, gravity of responsibility and scope of impact on the general campus community, and size of budget reviewed. She asked the committee for assistance in drafting a cover letter for other compensated committees to fill out the aforementioned questionnaire.
* ***Kym Faull*** asked if they were opening up a can of worms by creating a process by which committees could apply for compensation. ***Alison Winje*** confirmed that this questionnaire was only being sent to currently compensated committees. ***Christine Wilson*** explained that several years ago a few committees had inquired about whether or not they could receive stipends. She noted that this process began as a way to formalize any requests, requests that seemed like they were going to happen and ended up not coming through.
* ***Jas Kirt*** reaffirmed that even if SFAC decides not send out this letter to the Chancellor or other committees, they will still have these criteria set aside in case a committee does make a formal request for compensation.
* ***Jazz Kiang*** will join the compensation policy sub-committee and he and ***Theresa Stewart*** will draft the cover letter for the survey going to the committees which are currently compensated. ***Christine Wilson*** said it would be important to approach the committees’ answers objectively, and remind them that their answers would not have any effect on their stipends.
* ***Kym Faull*** asked who decided that the committees which currently receive stipends should be compensated in the first place. No one had an answer to this.

**CSF Report:**

* ***Moneel Chand*** informed the committee about the CSF meeting. He noted that the UCLA SFAC enjoys much greater support from campus administration than other SFAC committees. Many other campuses were also dealing with the issue of funding the 3% merit increase. UC Berkeley had been the only campus at that point to make a decision, and they had decided to fund 1% and leave the other 2% to the units.
* Another topic was starting a campaign to review how each SFAC conducts their unit reviews and requests for funding. It was generally agreed at the meeting that Santa Barbara has an effective process for reviewing their units that combines an online program and internal rubric. The topic of moving the unit reviews to an online format was discussed. ***Christine Wilson*** informed the committee that this conversation happened a while ago, and that it had led to the conclusion that creating a system would be very cost intensive to streamline a process that is not especially challenging.
* ***Moneel Chand*** informed the committee that the SB SFAC does not pay any maintenance for the Web site. ***Alison Winje*** and ***Moneel Chand*** will follow up with Santa Barbara to see if their system could be adopted and adapted to UCLA.
* The CSF is also starting 2 additional campaigns; one that would allow SFAC to review referenda to see if they are still necessary. ***Moneel Chand*** abstained from this vote at CSF. He pointed out that many units at UCLA are benefiting from referenda, and that this would not be appropriate for UCLA. He also noted that UCLA’s SFAC does not have jurisdiction over the campus’s referenda, but other UC SFACs do have that control. ***Christine Wilson*** reminded the committee that the same Regental policy governs all UC referenda, and that SFACs controlling referenda is against that policy. She also pointed out that this authority could politicize the committee.
* ***Moneel Chand*** informed the committee about another campaign that would create specific language for what counts as an SSF. Currently the Chancellor at UCSD is attempting to open up more possibilities of what the SSF funds can go towards, arguing that anything can count as a student service. ***Christine Wilson*** pointed out that because the SSF policy is very specific, this may be a case of enforcement rather than re-writing the policy. UC Davis is returning to CSF.

**Announcements:**

* ***Moneel Chand*** informed the committee that UCSHIP is undergoing some charter updates. There are campuses within the UC system that have elected to keep SHIP and some that have not. One question that was raised was whether or not UCLA will stay in UCSHIP. Currently they are leaning towards remaining in the program because of the length of time it takes to transfer to a new system, as demonstrated by UC Berkeley. UC Berkeley’s premium also rose when they transitioned, and it was estimated that UCLA’s premiums would rise by 10% if they switched.
* Last year UCLA had a deficit of approximately $2 million, which is relatively low compared to UC Davis’s deficit of $20 million, and the whole system in total has a deficit of $63 million. There is currently no plan to deal with the deficit. ***Alison Winje*** asked if the deficit was shared among all the campuses equally. ***Christine Wilson*** said that her understanding was that it was not.

**Adjournment:**

* A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. This vote was unanimous.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:16pm.