**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

**2323 Murphy Hall**

**Tuesday, October 9th, 2018 from 5:00pm – 7:00pm**

**Present:**

Graduates: Jazz Kiang, Denise Marshall, Javier Rodriguez

Undergraduates: Neemat Abdusemed, Paulina Macias, Christina Wang, Nicole Corona Diza

Administration: Mike Cohn, Director of SOLE

Deb Geller, Associate Dean of Students and Deputy Title IX Coordinator

Faculty Rep: Karen Rowe, Professor

APB Advisor: Ellen Hermann (Ex-Officio)

SFAC Advisor: Marilyn Alkin, SFAC Advisor

**Absent**: Barbara Wilson, UCLA Housing & Hospitality

1. **Called to Order**
	1. The meeting was called to order at 5:01 PM by, **Jazz Kiang**.
2. **Approval of Agenda**
	1. **Jazz Kiang** stated that he would like to make an amendment to the agenda by moving the Vice Chair elections before the review of the submission packet.
	2. **Christina Wang** moved to approve the agenda with the amendment. **Paulina Macias** stated that she seconds the motion to approve the agenda with the amendment. There were no objections to approving the agenda as amended.
3. **Review & Approve Minutes for October 2nd, 2018**
	1. **Jazz Kiang** informed the SFAC Committee to review the minutes from Tuesday, October 2nd, 2018. **Christina Wang** motioned to approve the minutes and Javier Rodriguez seconded the motion to approve the minutes. There were not any objections and the motion was approved by consent.
4. **CSF Report**
	1. **Jazz Kiang** informed the committee that he traveled with **Denise Marshall** to the Council on Student Fees at UC Santa Barbara. **Denise Marshall** stated that there are statewide concerns given the budget forecast as there is not an increase in student fees. All SFAC’s are different in composition, relationships with the Chancellor, and campus reporting. CSF is meeting with UCOP and a tentative agenda item is that CSF should be consulted about the budget in relation to student services and student fees.
	2. **Jazz Kiang** stated that it became clear that all campus SFAC’s operate differently. The takeaway is what systemwide priorities can be leveraged through the CSF space due to how different all SFAC’s are on their campus. A fiscal challenge is the lack of increase in SSF and hopefully discussion will increase with UCOP & at the Regents level.
	3. **Jazz Kiang** stated that in regards to politics, on the systemwide level many graduate student associations decided to pull out of the UC Student Association which formally represented all UC students. Some GSA’s felt as if it did not truly represent them and they created their own systemwide council. **Mike Cohn** stated that UCLA’s GSA pulled out of UCSA and were invited back to UCSA and now have a one-year non-paying relationship but GSA voted to remove the fee from graduate students at UCLA. There is now a move to get GSA to stay and UCLA’s GSA have led the way in questioning UCSA. **Deb Geller** stated that this year UCLA’s two presidents are co-chairing the systemwide council of presidents for USAC & GSA. Both are at UCSA but long-term is unclear of where the graduate students are going to go. **Jazz Kiang** stated that CSF wants to have a formal relationship with UCOP, regardless of what happens with the systemwide student associations CSF will be consulted with regarding the budget, & in regards to student fees and student services and this relationship is not arranged in a formal matter. CSF in practice now represents undergraduate and graduate students due to the composition of SFAC.
	4. **Jazz Kiang** informed that the last UCLA SFAC chair & CSF chair was at UCLA 10 years ago.
5. **User Fee Request**
	1. Ellen Hermann stated that she looked into the questions stated below
		1. What happens if students cannot afford these fees? The response **Ellen Hermann** stated that student aid policies will apply and its possible that some of these fees can be covered. Also, this is a voluntary fee that isn't required.
		2. SOAA interpreted the meaning of per unit as per quarter, so this is a per quarter fee stated by **Ellen Hermann**
		3. Why was the fee $100 and what made the difference for the fee to drop to $75? **Ellen Hermann** stated that the department plans to purchase more advanced equipment and will phase in the 4k environment over time. The items this might covered in the future would be similar to GoPro Hero6, lights, adobe creative cloud license, etc.
	2. **Jazz Kiang** stated that SFAC’s job is to determine whether or not this department should assess this voluntary fee and whether or not this is appropriate. **Jazz Kiang** clarified that different areas have different processes when purchasing equipment such as that of Student Affairs and OTC.
	3. **Deb Geller** sated that there are two parts to the proposal which is the purchasing of individual supplies, which is convenient for the students, and for the second part with a CPI adjustment that the price at least moves to $67. As a starting point SFAC should recommend that the price at least move to $67 or something in between $75. **Deb Geller** stated that a recommendation that can be made to the Chancellor would be to add an inflationary adjustment in the future to refrain from making significant future increases.
	4. **Jazz Kiang** stated to organize the conversation by sections as he started with Section A. **Denise Marshall** motioned to approve the user request for Section A and **Neemat Abdusemed** made a motion to second the user request for Section A. There was a unanimous pass with ten votes in favor.
	5. **Jazz Kiang** stated that the committee will begin discussing Section B. **Karen Rowe** stated that the $75 fee would be reasonable as the difference from $67 to $75 from $100 is relatively minimal. **Mike Cohn** stated that he agrees with **Karen Rowe** as the expectation by the students and those that are supporting and seeking employment from this department has a high level of expectation and these fees are not unreasonable to meet these demands. **Ellen Hermann** clarified that these fees are not required, but acknowledged the point that students may be expected to use this or similar equipment as part of their academic programs. **Christina Wang** stated that the upkeep of technology and the needing to maintain high quality an increase to the fee would be necessary. Javier Rodriguez motioned to recommend to the chancellor that SFAC supports the increase from $50 to $75. **Karen Rowe** made a second regarding SFAC supporting the increase from $50 to $75. The motion was approved with ten votes and no oppositions.
6. **Enter Executive Session**
7. **Exit Executive Session**
8. **New Process for SSF Funding & Review**
	1. **Jazz Kiang** stated that SFAC needs to move forward with making revisions to the submission packets for the units. **Karen Rowe** stated that the questionnaire brought up the issue of being more precise with what SFAC is looking for regarding using the word “initiative” rather than program or proposals. Also, via the questionnaire question 4 brings up vagueness asking units to “indicate financial need”.
	2. **Mike Cohn** stated that instead of using initiative, financial request could replace that word. Also, he agreed with **Karen Rowe** regarding dropping question four completely from the questionnaire. **Karen Rowe** asked **Jazz Kiang** if the intent of that question is to discuss how this would strengthen or enhance services. **Jazz Kiang** stated that every unit will submit their spreadsheet with their request on it and **Deb Geller** asked if useful information was provided in response to the use of units “indicating their financial need”. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked to what degree does the quality of applications influence the committee's decision on funding in the past? **Jazz Kiang** stated the committee always notes when a funding request is of poor quality but regardless of the quality the committee evaluates the request because the need is obviously present. **Deb Geller** stated that question four is unclear as it may be asking to justify the expenses or to justify the need for funding. Also, **Deb Geller** stated the word initiative could be replaced with service. Also, it was stated to add “what would you do if SFAC does not fund this initiative?” and how will students continue to be served or not be served and how will students be impacted if given everything a unit is asking for, part of what is asking for, or none of what a unit is asking for? **Mike Cohn** stated that in the past a question was asked if your program was funded for 1-2 years how will it be sustained if it does not receive future funding. **Karen Rowe** stated what will SFAC ask the units to provide that is grounded in fact and not wishful thinking as previous proposals stated there is an increase in demand without documentation.
	3. **Jazz Kiang** asked the committee if there is anything glaringly missing and **Ellen Hermann** stated that if the committee wants units to submit invoices and supplemental documents and it should be stated in the packet. **Karen Rowe** stated that an instructional document should be added to the packet. **Deb Geller** stated that units outside of Student Affairs have different processes regarding technology equipment and requesting additional positions or upgrading an existing position. **Jazz Kiang** stated that an instructional component can be considered but every unit that receives SSF is not a Student Affairs unit and that also needs to be considered in regards to the instructions on the document.
	4. **Jazz Kiang** began reviewing the Cover Letter and discussed the wording of the permanent funding and the discussion of areas of interest and if that should stay on the document. **Jazz Kiang** stated the concern that one of the concerns may open the flood gates for units to request permanent funding. **Deb Geller** stated that the document should state that there is limited amount of permanent funding available and the permanent funding will only be for existing positions. **Karen Rowe** stated that permanent funding requests will only be considered on a case-by-case basis. **Mike Cohn** stated what if for Student Affairs a letter was to say any request for permanent funding must be presented as a priority of Student Affairs and for the non-Student Affairs entity must justify why the request is being made as a divisional or institutional priority. Javier Rodriguez stated that APB should make recommendations on what requests should be considered for permanent funding. **Jazz Kiang** proposed cutting this particular line out of the letter and Javier made a motion to cut this line out of letter and **Karen Rowe** seconded the motion to cut this line from the letter. 7 committee members approved the motion, 3 opposed, and zero abstentions for cutting out the permanent funding line in the letter. **Mike Cohn** stated that there will be a lot of nervousness for units as the student population is growing, less SSF is being given, and will make many roles/positions feel uneasy as last year all 2019-2020 requests were denied.
	5. **Jazz Kiang** asked the committee if it's in the committee's best interest to have a list of priorities. **Deb Geller** stated the priorities should list programs and services that provide direct benefits to students. **Karen Rowe** stated that the first three priorities covers a range of things but it might be useful to indicate support for students that are experiencing unusual challenges for attending the university. Also, it needs to be modified to represent the forecast to reflect a steady state of student enrollment. **Jazz Kiang** stated that he would like to see some sort of signal in regards to how SFAC feels about mental health. **Deb Geller** stated that she challenges that 50% of the buyout that is for mental health all go directly to CAPS for clinical services as she would like to see SFAC take a position as the buyout funds should be used to address clinical, secondary, and tertiary mental health services that services our student body. Mike Cohn stated that an additional priority should be listed stating that previously funded initiatives by SFAC that have proven successful as a way of stating if something that has proven successful SFAC would like to consider funding it again.
	6. **Jazz Kiang** has asked the committee to provide additional comments prior to the next meeting.
9. **Announcements**
	1. **Jazz Kiang** stated that he met with Executive Management Group of Student Affairs and that they are thrilled about this process and have created an open line of communication for SFAC to tell them what is wanted.
	2. **Jazz Kiang** also stated that he met with the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and that that is an additional line of open communication.
10. **Meeting Adjourned at 6:57pm by, Jazz Kiang**
	1. **Denise Marshall** motioned to adjourn the meeting and Paulina Macias seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:57pm.