**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

**2325 Murphy Hall**

**4:00-6:00 PM**

**Tuesday, April 2, 2019**

**Present:**

Graduates: Jazz Kiang, Denise Marshall, Zak Fisher, Javier Rodriguez

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

Administration: Deb Geller, Associate Dean of Students and Deputy Title IX Coordinator, Mike Cohn, Director of SOLE, Barbara Wilson, UCLA Housing & Hospitality

Faculty Rep: Karen Rowe, Professor

APB Advisor: Ellen Hermann (Ex-Officio)

SFAC Advisor: Marilyn Alkin (Ex-Officio)

**Absent**:

**Call to Order**

* 1. **Jazz Kiang** called the meeting to order at 4:10pm.

1. **Approval of Agenda**
   1. **Jazz Kiang** shared the agenda.
   2. **Karen Rowe** moved to approve the agenda as amended. **Christina Wang** seconded. With no objections, the amended agenda was approved by consent.
2. **Review of Handouts**
   1. N/A

1. **Review and Approve Minutes** 
   1. **Neemat Abdusemed** moved, second by **Paulina Macias** to table the 2/26/19 and 3/12/19 minutes to the next meeting.
2. **Discussion on Charter and By Laws** 
   1. **Jazz Kiang** created a presentation on the SFAC Charter and Bylaws based on his research of other institutions. He shared the 2016-2017 Bylaw Amendment recommendation that was approved by the committee and submitted by the 2016-2017 SFAC Chair to Chancellor Block in June 2017. During the summer, the 2017-2018 SFAC Chair submitted his own letter of disagreement on the bylaw amendment, then Chancellor Block sent his response then shared the Chancellor’s response.
      1. **Karen Rowe** clarified that Chancellor Blocks response was provided after the SFAC Chair of 2017-2018 sent a separate letter that was not discussed by the SFAC committee.
      2. **Zak Fisher** stated that the Chancellor violated the SFAC Charter because his response was received after the 10-day window period.
      3. **Jazz Kiang** reiterated the need for additional bylaw review.
   2. **Jazz Kiang** then shared the 2016-17 Chair’s Continuity Report.
      1. **Deb Geller** observed that the Chancellor’s response indicated his support to not limit student voices. However, the bylaw amendment would have taken effect even though the Chancellor’s response shared disagreement absent further consultation. She was unsure if anything was done last year, but felt it was appropriate for this year’s council to review and send a letter of why they endorse or do not endorse the bylaw and point out why the bylaw took effect. If there is no consensus, then perhaps they can pass a different amendment.
      2. **Jazz Kiang** felt that SFAC needed to respond to this letter.
         1. **Javier Rodriguez** shared that there is a process in the Charter to amend and change the bylaws. **Jazz Kiang** clarified that he would like to review and respond to the letter.
   3. **Jazz Kiang** then shared other UC SFAC Bylaws.
      1. UC Riverside, San Diego, and San Francisco had similar language regarding their conflict of interest definitions. For example, any individual that serves in administrative capacity or receives salary from SSF funded programs may participate in the discussion on budget but shall not cast a vote.
      2. UC Santa Cruz defined conflict of interest as members shall disclose involvement with units on campus and will disqualify themselves from voting but should use their experience to provide factual information and data.
      3. UCLA includes student and non-student representatives who must remove themselves from the initial funding conversation but can return and vote.
         1. **Barbara Wilson** shared that UCLA’s bylaw was backwards and would like the legitimate personal experience to educate the committee and then during the actual vote, recuse themselves.
         2. **Mike Cohn** shared that his understanding of why UCLA had this bylaw was because individuals thought there would be a bias. He was also curious about what happens if the number of individuals employed in a certain unit (student and non-student) was lower than the number needed to make quorum. **Jazz Kiang** was unsure.
         3. **Jazz Kiang** commented that there were two aspects to consider. 1) Who has potential conflict of interest and how do we measure it? Student and non-student reps are currently held to the same standards. Other UCs are more specific. He also pointed this out because SFAC is a student majority committee in which students pay into the SSF. 2) Addressing potential conflict of interests such as stepping out of the room from participating in the initial conversation and then voting or the other UC’s practice the opposite.
         4. **Karen Rowe** stated the quorum is not an issue because it is the majority of the quorum of people present at the meeting. She then clarified that one who receives salary could apply to students, faculty, and administrative reps.
         5. **Barbara Wilson** stated that a salary does not change from month to month. An example is a stipend is month to month which can be a salary. A wage is the number of hours worked.
         6. **Zak Fisher** shared that as a student and low-income student, who pays $1128 per year like every student every year, this fee also gets decided how it is spent by students. Students struggle from food and housing insecurities while Chancellor Block gets to decide on that funding and SFAC acts as a check. Chancellor Block has acted incompetently with his responses. **Zak Fisher** felt something may be wrong based on Daily Bruin articles. He stated that SFAC is a check on a man who doesn’t give a damn about the rules of the committee. Lots of the funding goes to students and administrators. The bylaw is live because the Chancellor failed to act in time. He felt there should be a strong rule related to conflict of interest. He then asked why SFAC isn’t an all-student committee because administrators do not contribute towards the student services fee.
         7. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked a question of how the bylaw stands now. She asked if the voting options would determine whether the discussion in which the students recuse themselves would change. **Jazz Kiang** stated that can be decided later today.
         8. **Karen Rowe** answered **Nicole Corona Diaz’s** question by stating that student and admin representatives were recusing themselves when they had a conflict of interest defined by **Deb Geller** had a few weeks ago which included gaining benefit, administrative capacity, or employment in the unit. **Karen Rowe** then added that the line between factual data and advocating increased funding is a fine line to maintain. By not being present, it removed the temptation of sharing someone’s personal interest or to speak as an advocate.
         9. **Deb Geller** shared her thoughts. The difference between student and non-student. Regardless of working in a department that receives funding, students who work in the department are rarely empowered to make decisions on fund usage. If she had a magic wand, she would not require a recusal from students because they are recipients and don’t have the authority to make the same level to make decisions. She asked if it adds up to a true conflict of interest. Looking at administrative and faculty side, it feels backwards. She felt they should participate in a discussion but it is inappropriate to vote on funding for her unit because that is where the conflict would be. She suggested drafting a new amendment that would have a definition of conflict of interest but not ask students to recuse themselves or abstain from voting. Administrative and Faculty could participate in the discussion but not vote.
         10. **Barbara Wilson** recalled last year that before the Administrative Representative stepped out of the room, there were a set of questions asked before he left which left the committee more informed. Had the Administrative Rep stayed in the room, it may have created an uncomfortable environment for the committee. She added that what helped was the work the subcommittee did to deep dive and recommend to the entire committee the direction to either fund or not. The subcommittees spend hours discussing the requests.
         11. **Zak Fisher** felt this was a dog and pony show in which the Chancellor ultimately makes decisions. He felt that administrators were telling the committee members what to do such as not going to the media or watching the way they speak in the meeting.
         12. **Jazz Kiang** appreciated the conversation which identified nuances and comparisons to other campuses. In this reality with student and non-student representatives, he didn’t think it was right to put students on the same standard as administrative representatives who don’t pay the fee.
         13. **Neemat Abdusemed** shared that from her experience for three years. Her first year, she didn’t know what was happening. She reiterated that the check and balances are in the subcommittee work. The concern about corruption is valid but when the groups deliberate they find ways to prevent corruption. Students put their opinions and disagreement when appropriate. Her concern related to this topic was the difference between student and non-student representatives. Students have the best knowledge on how it affects them.
         14. **Nicole Corona Diaz** didn’t think the bylaw was wrong. She appreciated it and it seems like one student excusing themselves from one conversation wasn’t creating a huge impact. She didn’t understand why there was such a pushback. If it were her decision, she would step out from the conversation and vote.
         15. **Javier Rodriguez** shared from his experience that he received $10,000 compensation from SFAC this year and thought it would influence his decision in which he recused himself without knowing about this bylaw. He felt conflicted knowing how he could influence the vote and felt it was the right thing to do. Reiterating that directors are able to present about their unit and subcommittees are able to deliberate allows for the checks. However, if many of the people in the same subcommittee have a bias towards a unit, then the integrity of the subcommittee could be in jeopardy. He felt the administrative representatives should recuse themselves and not vote because they present to the committee and SFAC also sends clarifying questions.
         16. **Jazz Kiang** felt the proposed solution to address conflict of interest being levied at the same way between student and nonstudent representatives was missing from the conversations two years ago. **Karen Rowe** clarified bylaw amendment for conflict of interest discussion addressed the inclusion of both student and nonstudent representatives.
         17. Based on the current bylaw, **Jazz Kiang** requested a straw poll to see how many members believed this bylaw was perfect. Since folks were not satisfied, he recommended that SFAC work on improving it.
         18. **Javier Rodriguez** moved to update byalws by implementing the recusal process made in the bylaw amendment that was updated on June 6, 2017. **Karen Rowe** seconded. There were 7 votes in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstentions. The bylaw is currently live since the Chancellor failed to reject it appropriately.
             1. **Zak Fisher** requested a discussion for this motion be added as an agenda item at a future meeting.
             2. **Marilyn Alkin** clarified that all of the SFAC documents would be reviewed this year.
3. **Budget Update and Forecast**
   1. **Jazz Kiang** opened the conversation for Jeff Roth, Associate Vice Chancellor in Academic Planning and Budget.
      1. Jeff Roth shared that the UC and its campuses have done a good job responding to the financial circumstances over the last few decades. Campuses took on more students, despite funding levels not rising. Currently UCs have less funding per student compared to 2000-2001.
      2. At UCLA, the ratio of faculty to student, ratio of staff to students, amount of student services, and availability of lower divisions courses is worse. This makes the case for a need of inflation which would include student fees, state support, and others.
      3. The multi-year framework that was presented to the Regents is the proposed plan for the next couple of years.
         1. Challenge for the year directly ahead of us 2019-2020 suggests that UC needs $458 million in revenue to fund this plan. Some of this year’s funding provided by the state was provided as a one-time budget. There is a tuition freeze and the state hasn’t provided enough to make up for last year or this upcoming year’s freeze. The non-resident fee of 2.6% increase added $30million to make up for the shortfall. The revenue raised doesn’t match the cost increases for staff salary, benefits and same level of services. There are some proposed services needed including new faculty, offering enough courses, and support for students to help them complete their degree in 4 years.
         2. There is a plan to increase the SSF by 3% starting in 2020-2021.
         3. This year, the state provided one-time funding of $742,500.
         4. Put in estimates for committee on how much funds would be given out. Will need to be a bit conservative. There is a new CFO- Gregg Goldman and programs on rolling back budgets and finding savings.
   2. **Jazz Kiang** stated that this is major paradigm shift. It was regularly unpredictable. For many years, SFAC has had challenges because it does not have the forecasting that is regular and predictable. CSF shared this same concern with UCOP.
   3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked why the Regents want to increase the non-resident supplemental tuition.
      1. Jeff Roth clarified that this year, they did not raise it. It is an equation to solve for the instructional activities across all of UC for $10billion, which is for salaries and benefits.
   4. **Zak Fisher** clarified that the proposed budget plan of redirecting from non-resident aid is $14 million cut but not at UCLA. He observed that Student Mental Health and Basic Needs have no increase in funding over the next few years.
   5. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked why the Student financial aid for 19-20 was at $0. That is from the return to aid since there was no tuition increase.
   6. **Karen Rowe** was interested in the Faculty and Staff Compensation and Employee/Retiree Benefits. She observed a 3% increase per year and asked if that covers all staff funded out of SSF who are permanent. She was then concerned that those same staff are provided an additional 3% when departments submit funding requests for a 3% increase for staff compensation and benefits. Jeff Roth explained that any increase compensation for staff and faculty is typically covered with the 3% increase. Jeff Roth explained that the 3% would be allocated to staff merits and benefits based on the committee’s recommendation.
   7. **Karen Rowe** then asked if the one-time funding replaced the lack of increase to cover mental health. Jeff Roth explained that there was a theoretical 5% increase which did not happen in which the state provided a one-time 2.5% that went to mental health this year.
   8. **Deb Geller** asked if the $602 from last year was primarily due to benefits. Jeff Roth shared that the actual number will be figured out at the end of fiscal year. **Deb Geller** asked if the numbers reflected the shortfall from benefit and merits, would the future years be higher. **Ellen Hermann** stated that in theory it would increase.
   9. **Jazz Kiang** asked how likely the new paradigm would be implemented. Jeff Roth stated it is hard to predict depending on the vote.
   10. **Ellen Hermann** reviewed the forecast excel document which showed permanent funding decreasing even with the 3% increase.
   11. **Jazz Kiang** wanted to review potential outcomes on permanent funding so the committee has an idea of a funding number to shoot for.
   12. **Javier Rodriguez** felt there was a discrepancy by departments that are not taking into account work-study student employees, which would result in a surplus and asked if there was a way to check and balance those departments. **Ellen Hermann** suggested reviewing the trend reports ending balance, which can indicate departments that have funds available.
   13. **Jazz Kiang** stated they would return to this discussion. He encouraged subcommittees to consider these numbers.
   14. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked if recommendations could include removing permanent funding. **Jazz Kiang** said yes. **Ellen Hermann** stated there are some departments that are dependent on temporary funds.
4. **Discussion on Deliberation Process**
   1. Not discussed
5. **Announcements**
   1. **Zak Fisher** shared that he was running for GSA President and one movement is to abolish student fees.
   2. **Jazz Kiang** shared that Student Legal Services was having their 50th Anniversary and will share more information.
   3. **Jazz Kiang** and **Denise Marshall** will attend the CSF spring meeting next weekend to discuss some of the budget items that were brought up by Jeff Roth.
6. **Adjournment** 
   1. **Denise Marshall** moved to adjourn the meeting. **Deb Geller** seconded. With no objections, **Jazz Kiang** adjourned the meeting at 6:05pm.