**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

**2206 Murphy Hall**

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

**Tuesday, October 1, 2019**

**Present:**

Graduates: Denise Marshall, Janay Williams, Brittnee Meitzenheimer, Eliza Franklin-Edmonson

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

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

Faculty Rep: Karen Rowe, Professor Emerita

APB Advisor: Ellen Hermann (Ex-Officio)

**Absent**:

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

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

**Call to Order**

1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** called the meeting to order at 4:37pm.
2. **Approval of Agenda**

**Karen Rowe** moved to approve the agenda. **Paulina Macias** seconded. With no objections, the agenda was approved by consent.

1. **Review of Handouts**
	1. N/A

1. **Review and Approve Minutes**
	1. **Karen** **Rowe** stated that she had initial reservations about the 06.04.2019 and 6.11.19 minutes up for approval. She was concerned about grammar and edited for clarity the 6.04 Minutes, as always avoiding any changes to the substance of committee member’s statements. But for 6.11, there was a missing motion that would have indicated the lengthy meeting and discussions were in Executive session, hence the truncated listing of topics without votes. However, the substance of the discussions was appropriately summarized in the committee recommendations that submitted in the letters, crafted and based on extensive notes taken by 2018-19 Chair Jazz Kiang to the Chancellor. She recommended that new committee members carefully read the recommendation letters that were submitted to the Chancellor to better prepare for the coming year.
	2. **Karen** **Rowe** moved to approve the (edited) minutes for 06.04.2019. **Denise Marshall** seconded. With no objections, the minutes were approved by consent.
	3. **Karen Rowe** moved to approve the minutes for 06.11.2019. **Pauline Macias** seconded. With 3 votes to approve, 5 abstained (new SFAC members not present at the June meeting), the minutes were approved by consent.

1. **Reminder of Vice Chair Nominations**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the floor to discuss nominations for the position of SFAC Committee Vice Chair. She reviewed the general format and procedures for Vice Chair nominations including that nominations will occur during the Week 2 meeting and that elections will take place during the Week 3 meeting. She also reviewed requirements for nomination and clarified that only two students on this year’s SFAC committee, **Atreyi Mitra** and **Eliza Franklin-Edmonson**, are eligible for nomination and election because they will be returning to serve on the committee next year. Vice Chair requirements and responsibilities are reflected in the SFAC charter.
2. **SSF Budget Forecast Discussion**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the floor for **Ellen Hermann** to discuss SSF Budget Forecast. **Nicole Corona Diaz** explained that the purpose of this presentation was to help SFAC committee members better understand budget scenarios.
	2. **Ellen Hermann** introduced the committee to several possible budget scenarios that they should consider. First, she discussed the scenario of a 0% increase in SSF funding. A 0% increase would be low in terms of what is realistic for this year. She also discussed the possibility of a 3% SSF increase, which is likely high. **Ellen Hermann** clarified that the most likely result is somewhere in the middle of 0% and 3%., taking into account timing and discussions on “cohort tuition” models.
	3. **Ellen Hermann** reviewed the various components of the Permanent Budget, the one-time buyout from the State last year (which will not happen again moving forward), the carryforward from prior years, funding remaining after permanent allocations, and recommended amounts of budget allocation by SFAC Committees by year.
	4. **Karen Rowe** asked why the permanent funding decreased. **Ellen Hermann** clarified that the committee has historically voted for merit and benefits increases, which causes fluctuations in the permanent funding. Permanent stays the same unless committee votes to change this; however, this decreases because of benefit and merit changes that were approved for 2019-20 and 2020-21.
	5. **Ellen Hermann** said the amount that the SFAC committee has to consider this year is dependent on previous SFAC Committee recommendations and subsequent approvals from the Chancellor.
	6. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked if based on this chart, the SFAC committee has a little over $1 million to recommend. **Ellen Hermann** clarified that it depends on the timing. If you wanted to give out funding for 2020-2021 and gave max without going into deficit, you would have nothing left.
	7. **Atreyi Mitra** asked to clarify whose merits and benefits would increase with this continued approval. **Ellen Hermann** said that faculty are not included in this funding, but career staff of approved, primarily Student Affairs, departments would be included.
	8. **Ellen Hermann** said that since the campus has been growing over time, there have been more students enrolled and increases in SSF. So, SFAC previously had more money to consider and a considerable amount of unspent student fees. The SFAC Committee has spent that amount and now this year’s committee is working with less funds. She is assuming and recommending that the committee doesn’t give out any additional permanent funding.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** clarified that the committee can’t match what was spent last year. Now, after seeing and considering a 0% increase in SSF, she requested to see a scenario with full increase of 3%.
	9. **Ellen Hermann** said that most departments already have permanent funds, it is the temporary funds that they are requesting. **Eliza Franklin-Edmonson** asked to clarify which funds will fluctuate. **Ellen Hermann** said that funds can fluctuate for a variety of reasons. For example, if a staff member leaves in the middle of the year, there might be less funding needed for salaries as well as the associated benefits and insurances.
	10. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** asked if the committee should be explicit with departments about how much funding they have to work with this year in the call letter.
		1. **Ellen Hermann** strongly recommends that the committee is transparent with departments about available funding.
	11. **Karen Rowe** said that the committee gave all of the signals that they could in the call letter last year about the budgeting constraints. She felt that departments didn’t recognize those warnings, as evident by the large funding requests totaling nearly $8 million.
	12. **Kevin Kilgore** said that departments will ask for what they need regardless of what signals or warnings about budget restraints are presented. In addition, if the committee says there is a smaller budget, departments will still ask for more expecting to get less.
	13. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that the committee has the option to change the funding proposals to remove certain categories, such as honorariums. **Ellen Hermann** said that there are certain categories, like honorarium, that can be challenging to cut because there may be some other categories that may not function without them.
	14. **Karen Rowe** asked if the committee should consider altering the funding requests to perhaps only recommend for one or no years out.
		1. **Ellen Hermann** strongly recommends that the committee should provide recommendations for two years out (meaning added 2020-21 and new 2021-22), even considering this year’s constraints. She added that it can cause panic and feelings of instability in departments if SFAC only makes recommendations based on one year out. **Ellen Hermann** stated that it is important to provide stability for key student programs that committee deems valuable.
	15. **Carina Salazar** provided additional perspective from the staffing side of the funding proposal request process. She stated that many of the staff in these departments are not aware of these constraints and that this may be part of the reason why the committee received such large proposals. She believes administrator involvement in the SFAC committee is critical for improving communication to staff and departments.
	16. **Ellen Hermann** shared that adding a specific number describing this year’s budget to the call letter is helpful and puts the financial constraints into perspective. It lets people know what’s possible and what is not.
	17. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that this conversation can continue later in the meeting when the committee discusses the unit review and call letter process later in agenda.
	18. **Karen Rowe** stated that sustaining certain programs that have been given repeated funding (with the example of Early Childhood Education that took $450K last year) takes a considerable amount out of the budget. If that were funded only along with the Benefits and Merits, the total $1 million would exceed what is projected to be available for temporary fund allocations. There are certain sizable amounts that are nonnegotiable unless you want to cut large programs.
3. **Approval of Proposed Amendments to the SFAC Charter**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the floor for discussion of an amendment to the charter to allow transfer students with only one year remaining to serve on the Committee . The suggested amendments to the charter were intended to be inclusive of transfer students for one or two-year appointments and there was additional discussion as to whether or not Masters students should be included in this amendment. USAC currently has a transfer student that they would like to recommend for the vacant undergraduate representative position; however, this student is graduating next year and as the charter stands now, they are no longer eligible for the seat. However, if there are one-year terms available for transfer students, there may be fewer students who have the opportunity to run for chair.
	2. **Denise Marshall** stated that she has reached out to Heather Adams from the Transfer Student Center to get her perspective on the matter, but has not yet received a response. She asked if the committee needed to vote on this matter today or if it was possible to wait.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** clarified that there is a slight sense of urgency because USAC would like to move forward with a transfer appointee and that student is now waiting on the committee to see if an amendment to the charter is possible to allow for the appointment. If there are continued delays, USAC may move forward with an alternate student.
	3. **Denise Marshall** asked if the committee would just offer one year only for transfer students and then ask them to apply for a second year on the committee or if the committee would offer transfer students up to two years.
	4. **Atreyi Matri** expressed concerns that transfer students are already disadvantaged and that is seems unfair to make them have to apply for second year on the committee when non-transfer students aren’t required to apply for a second year.
	5. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that she advocates for transfer-specific language in the proposed amendment given the situation this year.
	6. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** asked to clarify why graduate students in one-year programs were not included in the proposed amendment. She stated that she thinks the committee should be comprehensive now to include Masters students in order to avoid having to go through this process again.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** clarified that Masters students were addressed in some language, but this specific situation is not one that comes up often. She also clarified that the committee can postpone the vote until next week or vote for just the transfer-specific language part now and postpone the additional language for the Masters degree students later.
	7. **Janay Williams** asked how the committee could include Masters degree programs that start in fall quarter after meetings have started. Since these students wouldn’t be enrolled over the summer, it seems unclear how those students would be appointed beforehand.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that this would mean these students wouldn’t be appointed until after they were enrolled. This would allow them to be appointed late, but they could still sit in on orientation.
	8. **Janay Williams** stated that she doesn’t believe the committee should alter things for Masters degree students until we have that specific scenario present itself. The committee can focus their attention on this situation now for transfers because this situation is pressing.
	9. **Karen Rowe** commented that the SFAC committee positions come with an immense learning curve and that there is value in serving two-year terms.
	10. **Eliza Franklin-Edmonson** stated that she believes the committee is ready to vote today.
	11. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** doesn’t want to hold up the process and is happy to revisit next week, but is also concerned with the idea that the committee may be rushing a decision. She also wants to address inclusivity of gendered language in the statement to ensure that instances of “her/his” are instead replaced with “they.”
	12. **Paulina Macias** asked to adjust the proposed language from “if their eligibility changes, they have the option to stay on the committee for a second year” to express that they are expected to continue on their second term. The new language could say “they shall carry out” instead of “they have the option to.”
	13. **Atreyi Mitra** moved and **Karen Rowe** seconded to approve the amended changes to the Charter. There were 7 votes to approve, 2 votes against, and 1 vote to abstain. The motion did not pass due to charter bylaws that require 2/3 affirmative vote, including those voting members who are absent and any vacancies. Given the 12 voting positions, 8 votes to approve were needed.
4. **Discussion of Unit Review Process and Call Letter**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the floor to discuss the Unit Review Process and Call Letter. She stated that the committee needs to decide what questions to ask of departments in order to gather relevant and helpful information that will impact the decision-making process, otherwise unit reviews will be unnecessarily long.
	2. **Janay Williams** sought clarification on the difference between the call letter and the unit review as well as details about the process that took place last year.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** clarified that the call letter and unit review requests were sent out at the same time during the Fall quarter. The processes were combined and both had the same deadline. However, even with this timeline, the committee was still making final decisions during Finals Week in Spring Quarter. There was, however, a benefit to having departments complete both by the same deadline so that the committee could ask questions about both the call letter and the unit review when the departments were invited to speak at the SFAC meeting.
		2. **Kevin Kilgore** asked if the committee should set a time when we want to have these reviews finished so that members aren’t having to make large cuts to the budget at the last minute.
		3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** agreed that this would be ideal and that the committee needed to finalize those deadlines soon.
	3. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** asked for clarification about the purpose of the subcommittee review time in Winter.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** added that this year is unique because the committee doesn’t have a lot of money to consider, so it may not be necessary to meet in subcommittees in the same way. This year, working separately might be a disadvantage because the committee is working with a very set number. It’s also important to note that some of the questions that were asked of departments last year may not apply, given this year’s budget scenario.
	4. **Karen Rowe** stated that it is important to review unit reviews from the previous years. In reviewing proposals from departments, the committee oftentimes doesn’t have the information that is needed. In previous years, committee members had to go back to departments to ask specific questions. This year’s committee might want to be more targeted with justifications for different budget items because different directors use different methods for calculating some things (e.g. Work Study salaries).
	5. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** said that the committee needs to review its priorities and that process can be helpful in formulating the questions that we ask departments. SFAC shouldn’t waste units’ time preparing information that’s not helpful.
		1. **Karen Rowe** added that organizational charts can be incredibly helpful information to request from departments.
	6. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked if the committee believed that they can have a unit review and/or call letter drafted to an ideal standard by the end of Week 4’s meeting (10/22). She added that it would give the committee three additional weeks to finalize questions and would give the committee time to determine what metrics they would like to request from departments.
		1. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** added that it would be helpful if committee members can use track changes/comments on materials up for review to help clarify questions between meetings in order to make weekly meeting time more efficient.
5. **Announcements**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** announced that the Council on Student Fees (CSF) meeting takes place this weekend. She will be attending the meeting and will present information at next week’s meeting.
		1. **Karen Rowe** requested that **Nicole Corona Diaz** gather information about how SFAC committees from other UC campuses are dealing with budget challenges.
		2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** clarified that it can be challenging to get everyone on the same page because each campus is in a different financial situation and has different needs.
6. **Adjournment**
	1. **Atreyi Matri** moved to adjourn the meeting**. Paulina Macias** seconded. With no objections, **Nicole Corona Diaz** adjourned the meeting at 6:30pm.