**Student Fee Advisory Committee**

**3:00-5:00pm**

**Friday, January 15, 2021**

**Virtual Meeting**

**Attendees:**

Graduates: **Jackie Markt-Maloney, Gaby Barrios, Paarth Shah, Laxman Dahal**

Undergraduates: **Atreyi Mitra, Bradley Alvarado, Devanee Matcham, Samantha Solemnidad**

Administration: **Carina Salazar, Charles Turner,** **Erinn McMahan**

Faculty Rep: N/A

APB Advisor: **Ellen Hermann**

Absent: **Christine Wilson**

**Atreyi Mitra** called the meeting to order at 3:00pm.

1. **Approval of Agenda**
	1. The agenda was not approved.
2. **Approval of Minutes for Fall 2020 Week 9**
	1. **Gaby Barrios** motioned and **Laxman Dahal** seconded to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously.
3. **Discussion of Charter & Bylaws Sub-committee**
	1. **Atreyi Mitra** summarized that this subcommittee reviews the Charter and Bylaws every other year.
	2. **Bradley Alvarado** shared that the subcommittee was looking to update the language. One area to update is the Vice Chair language to be inclusive and allow one-year SFAC appointments the same opportunity to be Vice Chair.
		1. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** asked if members in a one-year appointment will have the same opportunity for the Chair position as well.
		2. **Bradley Alvarado** was unsure how a one-year appointment could be Chair since the elections for Chair occurs during spring quarter and appointments made by USAC and GSA occur after we have a Chair. **Bradley Alvarado** recommends keeping it a second year of a two-year appointment. **Atreyi Mitra** thinks is a good idea in theory but the student governments typically take a long time to appoint representatives and being Chair is a high learning-curve and can be challenging for someone in their first year.
		3. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** shared that members seem to be on the same page that the Chair position should remain as is.
	3. **Gabby Barrios** added the change of language to reflect the fact that SFAC uses small committee Robert’s Rules.
	4. **Atreyi Mitra** added that SFAC currently does not have the Faculty Representative. Currently the Chair from Academic Senate’s Committee on Committees is having a challenge identifying a representative due to eligibility rules. This is one area the subcommittee would like to look at to be more equitable.
		1. **Gabby Barrios** added that the selection process is subject to the process the Academic Senate places similar to undergraduate and graduate representatives are selected through USAC and GSA. Currently their protocols includes tenured and emeritus faculty possibly due to the time commitment for SFAC.
		2. **Atreyi Mitra** mentioned that next time, the SFAC Chair can reach out directly to the Academic Senate to begin the process of identifying the Faculty Rep.
	5. **Atreyi Mitra** shared another change regarding the recusal process. **Atreyi Mitra** asked SFAC members to review the currently language and share thoughts on the purpose of the recusal process.
		1. **Bradley Alvarado** believed this statement was to prevent any conflict of interests. For example, if SFAC was discussing the Career Center, **Carina Salazar** would need to leave the room while SFAC is discussing the funding request to prevent **Carina Salazar’s** personal bias of funding towards the Career Center. **Carina Salazar** would then be invited back in after the discussion.
		2. **Paarth Shah** agreed with **Bradley Alvarado’s** point. In terms of mitigating it, this is imperfect because SFAC would need to know who these people are and to be sensitive to their employment concerns. **Paarth Shah** was unsure how this has worked in the past but if it worked well, then SFAC should continue, but if it is just a formality, then SFAC should review it.
		3. **Carina Salazar** shared that she can go either way. From a logistical perspective, the same argument can be used towards students on where they work and their efficacy. She has no concerns for this year. However, it is beneficial to have someone from these departments to be able to answer questions SFAC may have.
		4. **Bradley Alvarado** suggested having the member stay in the room to answer questions the committee may have, but to prevent any conflict of interest, can remove their vote. However, **Bradley Alvarado** does not like the idea of removing a vote.
		5. **Ellen Hermann** shared that the recusal process was added about two years ago but was a practice before and then became more contentious. Some members liked it and some didn’t and that’s when the amendment was written. However, it was not enforced last year but she recommends that moving forward SFAC, whether the committee decides to make language changes or not, follow the bylaws. She explained how the review process worked in previous years, not including last year, SFAC went line by line reviewing each line item request. Those employed by the department would recuse themselves, the rest of the committee had a discussion, the member was brought back, then the committee voted. Last year, the recusal process wasn’t followed. Line items were grouped more so there wasn’t a vote on each line item and rather on a process. The vote was by majority. At the end, SFAC votes on the letter which is also by majority.
		6. **Gabby Barrios** shared that she doesn’t think the amendment is a problem but rather can become unwieldy because SFAC has an equal number of people representing all the different factions. **Gabby Barrios** shared that if SFAC followed this process, SFAC would have a conversation without the person present, then another conversation with the knowledgeable person present. The committee would then vote and if someone reconsiders, they would have to vote again. **Gabby Barrios** shared that this amendment was created in the past but may not reflect the day to day practical running of this committee and does not think it is necessary.
		7. **Atreyi Mitra** shared some historical context behind the amendment which included some student politics and concerns that members from the Community Programs Office (CPO) dominated discussions. However, **Christine Wilson** shared with **Atreyi Mitra** that CPO had been audited and never found anything.
		8. **Carina Salazar** shared that she does not have any concerns. This is a very different committee from last year. Although we all have biases, which is human nature, **Carina Salazar** doesn’t have any concerns.
		9. **Ellen Hermann** added to the historical context that this was still a practice before the amendment was created and believed it was less contentious at the time. **Ellen Hermann** asked SFAC to keep in mind that in some cases, both students and administrators do perhaps have an outsized influence on how the committee votes. She also added that one of the major arguments against the amendment was that it disenfranchised students who have to work and support themselves during their program.
		10. **Atreyi Mitra** asked SFAC how they would recommend changing this amendment.
			* **Paarth Shah** asked if we and future committees need this amendment.
			* **Carina Salazar** thinks SFAC should keep some form of the amendment but change the language and think about how to implement it.
			* **Samantha Solemnidad** agreed with **Carina Salazar** that we need to keep this amendment even though it is not needed for our committee. **Samantha Solemnidad** shared this is a lot of history about how this amendment came to be and would like to discuss it further with the committee.
			* **Gabby Barrios** understood that historical context is important but wanted to look at the amendment in the context of what is the goal and whether it is serving the goal. The committee needs to discuss whether we need to have people recuse themselves from the discussion. It does not prohibit those people from voting. This amendment just adds more process to the situation. For example, SFAC should decide if the member needs to recuse themselves from the first conversation but may return for the second conversation and vote. If SFAC decides to take it a step further and remove the person’s ability to vote, that could disenfranchise working students. **Gabby Barrios** believes those employed in those units are very knowledgeable about the unit, even if they’re not students, have student interests at heart.
			* **Ellen Hermann** mentioned that a suggestion of prior SFAC members was that the amendment could only apply to administrative representatives so students are not penalized. Another earlier suggestion was to include the members in the discussion but have them recuse themselves from the vote.
			* **Bradley Alvarado** asked if the amendment applied to all members. **Atreyi Mitra** confirmed it applied to all members.
			* **Ellen Hermann** added that it could also be viewed as unfair to have some members providing additional information for the units they work in while other units do not have that opportunity.
			* **Atreyi Mitra** added that although she is not employed at an office, she may have lots of information about CARE’s services because of her interests.
			* **Jackie Markt-Maloney** stated that people have very different perspectives and recommended providing a few options for SFAC to consider to see where people stand.
			* **Erinn McMahan** asked what problem SFAC is trying to solve before we figure out the language.
			* **Gabby Barrios** shared that it sounds like previously, there were two discussion: in the first discussion, members recused themselves; in the second discussion, members rejoined the meeting; then everyone votes. The other issue is whether the member is allowed to vote or not.
			* **Carina Salazar** shared that based on the past, conversations were heated and prolonged which is why the amendment was created and the member joins just for the vote.
	6. **Atreyi Mitra** added that another potential issue is if the committee makes any changes to the Charter or Bylaws, the Chancellor has 14-days to respond to the committee.
		1. **Ellen Hermann** shared that depending on your perspective there can be different opinions on whether or not these are “issues”. From an administrative standpoint, it may be challenging to get in touch with the Chancellor and make sure he responds within 14 days. From a student perspective, the fast response may be viewed as a positive. If the Chancellor doesn’t respond within 14-days, the amendment becomes law.
		2. **Atreyi Mitra** added if the Chancellor doesn’t like the changes, he needs to attend a meeting with SFAC.
		3. **Ellen Hermann** shared that if the Chancellor does not approve the amendment, then he meets with the committee to explain.
		4. **Bradley Alvarado** stated that three weeks is too long to wait for a response.
		5. **Ellen Hermann** recommended more flexibility that would allow the Chancellor to make minor alterations to the wording of amendments.
	7. **Atreyi Mitra** summarized that the Charter and Bylaws committee will take the feedback provided and will potentially draft new language. **Samantha Solemnidad** asked if this topic discussion would continue with the larger SFAC group or within the subcommittee. **Atreyi Mitra** clarified that the subcommittee would develop and propose concrete language to be discussed at the meeting. **Samantha Solemnidad** shared that if SFAC wanted to discuss the amendment with historical context, **Samantha Solemnidad** would be willing to share **Samantha Solemnidad’s** knowledge on the history of this amendment.
4. **Discussion of unit review process timeline**
	1. **Atreyi Mitra** shared that she would like to discuss the unit review process with SFAC.
	2. **Ellen Hermann** shared there are about 30 unit review submissions this year.
	3. **Atreyi Mitra** shared that SFAC would start the process in Week 4 and finish Week 10 or the beginning of spring quarter. There would be four subcommittees with at least one undergrad, one grad, and one administrative rep. If there are 32 units, each subcommittee will take 8 units. Subcommittees would meet outside of the SFAC meeting times to review units and develop a summary report for each unit. Each week, one subcommittee will provide a summary of their review and lead a discussion for at least 2 units.
	4. **Laxman Dahal** asked if all units will take equal time to filter. There may be some units SFAC will want to take a deep dive on. **Laxman Dahal** recommended addressing spend more time on the longer units first then review the shorter units.
	5. **Ellen Hermann** did not recommend that approach.
5. **Supporting the TSR Letter to Vice Chancellor Gorden**
	1. **Bradley Alvarado** asked SFAC if they felt comfortable supporting a letter being written to Vice Chancellor Gorden to expedite the hiring process for the Transfer Student Center. **Bradley Alvarado** stated that the center has been without a director since spring of 2019 and currently has an interim director who is also the director of the Bruin Resource Center. While the interim director has done an amazing job at running both centers, both centers deserve their director to be paying attention to their own center to focus fully to serve the students that they serve. Transfer students have been waiting for months for Vice Chancellor Gorden and HR to sign off to post the job. **Bradley Alvarado** had asked **Atreyi Mitra** who believed it would be better if SFAC voted so it come from one entity. **Atreyi Mitra** added that last year, the SFAC Chair signed a letter as Chair which suggested that SFAC agreed when it was not discussed nor agreed upon by the committee.
	2. **Carina Salazar** shared that she would have to ask **Christine Wilson** because Vice Chancellor Gorden is their boss.
	3. **Bradley Alvarado** clarified that they letter is not an attack on Vice Chancellor Gorden but to hurry up the process to be completed by spring 2021.
	4. **Gabby Barrios** recommended that SFAC members sign individually to be mindful of the administrative representatives.
6. **Gabby Barrios** made a motion to adjourn the meeting and **Samantha Solemnidad** seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:16pm.