**Student Fee Advisory Committee**

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

**Friday, January 29, 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**

Faculty Rep: N/A

SFAC Advisor: **Christine Wilson**

APB Advisor: **Ellen Hermann**

Absent: **Erinn McMahan**

**Atreyi Mitra** called the meeting to order at 3:05pm.

1. **Community Sharing**
	1. SFAC members shared anything SFAC does not know about members
2. **Approval of Agenda**
	1. **Bradley Alvarado** motioned and **Paarth Shah** seconded to approve the agenda.
3. **Approval of Minutes for Winter 2020 Week 2**
	1. **Gaby Barrios** motioned and **Laxman Dahal** seconded to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously.
4. **Discussion of SFAC temporary requests**
	1. **Atreyi Mitra** shared that the spreadsheet that **Ellen Hermann** created will be a holistic perspective of how much money was requested. **Christine Wilson** shared that this exercise exists because as the temporary dollars you give decrease, you need to then make really hard decisions. It also gets you in the frame of mind that you have to make choices on what you want to fund and what you want to fund a little less. This prevents being in the ninth week of slashing a third of what you want to fund. **Atreyi Mitra** shared that there may be a few more requests from late submissions so the total may increase.
	2. **Ellen Hermann** summarized that the table included all of the requests submitted this year. There was a total of $565,000 for the first year which SFAC discussed probably not providing any funding recommendations. For the second year, SFAC discussed recommending around $1.75 million but given lower enrollment and wanting to fund the benefit shortfall, would go down to $1 million. Also, you will see organizations listed their requests by order of priority. SFAC will notice that many were listed as priority one which leaves the committee to decide which to fund.
		1. **Laxman Dahal** asked how the priorities quantified differ. **Ellen Hermann** shared that it depended on the department but were inconsistent. Student Affairs shared their order of priority in an email. **Christine Wilson** will forward the email from Student Affairs.
	3. **Ellen Hermann** summarized then reviewed how the spreadsheet was organized. For example, employee requests were grouped together to include salary, associated benefits, TIF which includes telephone and other technology setup, and infrastructure which includes supplies. Initiatives and programs may have multiple lines.
		1. **Devanee Matcham** shared that this is a lot of information. **Devanee Matcham** believed after reviewing and going through the spreadsheet, it will become clear.
		2. **Samantha Solemnidad** appreciated that SFAC will be reviewing requests in smaller groups.
	4. **Atreyi Mitra** shared that these are the temporary funding requests which SFAC will provide funding recommendations for fiscal year 2021-2022 and 2022-2023.
5. **Discussion of SFAC Unit Review and Funding Request Timeline**
	1. **Atreyi Mitra** summarized that the other requests are for permanent funding requests. The unit review is an opportunity to gauge and understand how units are using their permanent money and if they are aligned with SFAC priorities and serving students. SFAC members will be divided into smaller groups and if members have conflict of interests with the units, the SFAC chair will switch groups. Between weeks 5-7 groups will discuss and review the questions from the unit review document to see how they reflect priorities. Groups will send the SFAC Chair and Advisor any follow up questions or request missing information for the unit to respond.
	2. **Christine Wilson** drafted a timeline for these unit reviews.
		1. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** asked a clarifying question regarding individual and group review expectations. **Atreyi Mitra** shared that members would review units on their own time and group time during week 5-7 is for discussion of the units.
	3. **Atreyi Mitra** recommended that SFAC complete the unit reviews this quarter as much as they possibly can. Spring quarter will be focused on the temporary requests because SFAC will be familiar with the units after the review during winter quarter. SFAC members will receive the document **Ellen Hermann** presented at the beginning of the meeting and each member will provide their individual recommendations within a $1.75 million limit. Providing individual recommendations allows for SFAC to have in-depth discussions and come to a consensus which will lead to the recommendation letter for the Chancellor which will need to be approved by the committee.
		1. **Ellen Hermann** asked if time is set aside to discuss the benefit shortfall before the committee discusses temporary funding requests. **Atreyi Mitra** asked **Ellen Hermann** to explain benefit shortfalls. Benefit shortfall is typically paired with merit increases, which will probably not happen next year. Benefits includes health insurance, vision care, dental and other benefits employees receive from UCLA. The cost goes up every year and the units are not given more funding for the increase each year. This would cover the cost of the increase. Shortfall can change a bit each year but it is hard to predict. If people leave, then the funding that was going to their benefits could cover the shortfall for other people’s benefits so it fluctuates across the years and depends whether the positions are full. **Christine Wilson** added that some unionized positions will receive raises which are already approved and covered this year.
		2. **Christine Wilson** asked if Student Affairs included it in their requests. **Ellen Hermann** shared that it was included in the email text that was forwarded to the committee.
6. **Creating game plan within your small group**
	1. **Christine Wilson** shared that all of the documents are in Box and recommended that small groups review at least one unit to see how this works and fine-tune the process.
	2. SFAC spent time in breakout rooms to create a plan.
	3. **Atreyi Mitra** asked for recommendations that came out of small groups.
		1. **Paarth Shah** shared that it would be useful if SFAC standardize responses so it’s easier to compare and contrast in the larger group. **Paarth Shah** recommended that small groups come up with four to five points of feedback both positive and negative on the units. A second recommendation was to come up with two or three units that groups thought needed the most funding and two or three units that needed the least and a description of why, focusing on SFAC’s priorities.
		2. **Christine Wilson** agreed with the first recommendation.
		3. **Gaby Barrios** asked if groups were answering questions in the guide as a standard which would be a similar format. **Gaby Barrios** agreed with **Paarth Shah** that the end goal is to have takeaways that are to the point be developed before presenting to your small group and then before presenting to the large committee.
		4. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** asked if members had any preliminary ideas about how they will present information back to the larger committee such as using a PowerPoint or scrolling through notes but would like to be mindful of time it will take to create a presentation.
			1. **Bradley Alvarado** was considering using a PowerPoint but will most likely use notes and documents to save on time.
			2. **Atreyi Mitra** mentioned that it doesn’t have to be a formal presentation but if you’d like to use PowerPoint, members could.
		5. **Bradley Alvarado** asked if the small groups had questions or requests for missing information from the units, would they direct those to the SFAC Chair or Advisor or can the small groups reach out themselves.
			1. **Christine Wilson** recommended sending questions through Atreyi’s SFAC email account because it is recognizable as the SFAC Chair.
			2. **Atreyi Mitra** confirmed that she can send the questions and copy group members on the email.
		6. **Christine Wilson** mentioned that **Jackie Markt-Maloney** asked how to structure the unit reviews. **Christine Wilson** referred to the guide with example questions. She mentioned some questions may be relevant while other questions may not. **Christine Wilson** suggeted that small groups present highlights to the larger committee.
7. **Devanee Matcham** made a motion to adjourn the meeting and **Paarth Shah** seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:57pm.