**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

**2206 Murphy Hall**

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

**Tuesday, October 8, 2019**

**Present:**

Graduates: Denise Marshall, Janay Williams, Brittnee Meitzenheimer

Undergraduates: Nicole Corona Diaz (Chair), Atreyi Mitra

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

Faculty Rep: Karen Rowe, Professor Emerita

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

**Absent**:

Deb Geller, Associate Dean of Students

Paulina Macias, Undergraduate Representative

Eliza Franklin-Edmonson, Graduate Representative

APB Advisor: Ellen Hermann (Ex-Officio)

**Call to Order**

1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** called the meeting to order at 4:53pm.
   1. **Denise Marshall** asked to clarify the end time for the meeting given the late start.
   2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that the meeting would end at the normal 6:30pm end time as planned.
2. **Review and Approve Minutes** 
   1. **Karen Rowe** stated that she would like to make edits to the 10.01.19 meeting minutes. She suggested changing parts of what **Ellen Hermann** said in the 10.01.19 meeting in order to clarify notes and statements. **Karen Rowe** will reach out to **Ellen Hermann** in order to confirm that she is comfortable with her suggested edits.
   2. **Karen Rowe** moved to table the edits for the minutes from 10.01.19 until after **Ellen Hermann** has a chance to review her suggestions. **Denise Marshall** seconded. With no objections, the minutes from 10.01.19 were tabled by consent.
3. **Approval of Agenda**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that the because two voting members are absent from today’s meeting, it is unlikely that the present voting members will be able to vote and pass the proposed amendment to the SFAC Charter today. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that although the committee was under the impression that last week’s vote to approve the proposed amendment passed with 7 votes, she has since reviewed the SFAC Charter and Bylaws and the committee in fact needed 8 votes to pass. The proposed amendment did not pass at the 10.01.19 meeting. She reminded committee members that they can try to vote today or they can table it until next week.
      1. **Denise Marshall** clarified that her vote had not changed since last week.
   2. **Karen Rowe** made a motion to approve agenda without item five (Approval of Proposed Amendments to SFAC Charter)**.** **Atreyi Mitra** seconded. With no objections, the agenda without item five was approved by consent.
4. **Review of Handouts**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** provided the committee with documents presented by students from UC Davis during the recent Council on Student Fees (CSF) meeting. She said the UC Davis students talked about how their own SFAC committee runs and how their unit review process, which they referred to as a their “questionnaire,” is sent out to departments over the summer before the committee starts to meet in the fall. This format allows their SFAC committee to review Unit Review information as soon as they convene in the fall quarter.
      1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** spoke with **Christine Wilson** about the UCLA unit processes; she stated that units at UCLA are typically doing their own internal reviews over the summer anyway, so it may be a convenient time for the SFAC committee to ask them about this information.
5. **Vice Chair Nominations**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the floor to discuss nominations for the position of SFAC Committee Vice Chair. She reminded the committee that this week’s meeting will only include nominations for the Vice Chair position and that next week’s meeting will include elections for the Vice Chair position. Members that are nominated have the ability to decide whether or not they would like to accept nominations. The Vice Chair election vote will be anonymous.
   2. **Karen Rowe** asked if there is any constraint on quorum for voting in the new Vice Chair. Specifically, she would like clarification on how many voting members are required to be present at the meeting to vote in a new Vice Chair.
      1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** responded that she is unsure and needs to check the Charter. She reminded the committee that nominations do not require a vote. She does not believe quorom will be an issue at the next meeting.
      2. **Karen Rowe** stated that she believes that the vote will be by majority of those present at the meeting.
   3. **Denise Marshall** moved to nominate **Eliza Franklin-Edmonson. Karen Rowe** seconded. With no objections, the nomination for **Eliza Franklin-Edmonson** for Vice Chair was approved by consent.
   4. **Janay Williams** moved to nominate **Atreyi Mitra.** **Karen Rowe** seconded. With no objections, the nomination for **Atreyi Mitra** for Vice Chair was approved by consent.
6. **Discussion of Unit Review Process**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the floor to discuss the Unit Review Process. She restated how important it is that the committee carefully selects the questions that they will ask during the Unit Review Process. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that the unit review process can help the committee to better understand the units, their missions, how programs benefit students, and if students utilize their services. This differs from the discussion about funding priorities in that funding priorities can help the committee convey which categories of funding requests they are and are not considering.
   2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** provided committee members with unit review questions that have been used in previous years and asked the committee for their feedback on each question in order to finalize the list of questions to send to units this year. She clarified that the call letter and request for funding documents are separate from the unit review questions.
   3. **Janay Williams** stated that she liked question 2, “How many students utilize your SSF-funded services each academic year? Do your services target specific populations of students? If so, what are those populations and why? (200 words max.)”
      1. **Janay Williams** said that she liked this question because it shows that the funds are going directly back to students. However, she was unsure about the wording of “why” at the end of the question and suggested the committee change this question to ask units about the specific needs of the populations that they are serving.
   4. **Janay Williams** stated that she was confused by question 8, “Please review the attached ‘SSF Actual Trend Report’ for your campus entity. Explain any changes in overall revenue, overall compensation, and overall expenditures. (150 words max.)”
      1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that trend reports give the committee a breakdown of where the unit’s funding has been going, the trends in their carryforward funding, a specific number detailing how big their permanent funding is, and how much temporary funding they’ve been receiving over the course of several years. It is important to note that there is a lot of fluctuation in these numbers each year for a given unit, but these reports provide a general trend for the committee to consider. She projected an example of a trend report from the LGBT center.
   5. **Atreyi Mitra** stated that she recently met the Dean of Students, Maria Blandizzi, who conveyed that the LGBT Center was quite underfunded and only had four staff to serve a large number of students.
      1. **Christine Wilson** reminded the group that the LGBT Center has grown significantly over the last several years to address growing student demand. She said that the SFAC committee consistently faces the challenge of weighing the importance of serving a large number of students and the importance of serving special populations of students.
   6. **Karen Rowe** said it is challenging to fully understand the trend reports without seeing it as a cross section of multiple units. It is easy to make inappropriate assumptions about funding without being able to compare the unit in question to other unit reports.
   7. **Kevin Kilgore** asked to reconsider the wording of the question, “If applicable, why does your campus entity have carryforward SSF funds? What is your plan and timeline for utilizing this carryforward in line with the originally approved purpose? (200 words max.)” He said that there may be a better way to ask this question to better understand the actual carryforward amounts. He stated in a last week’s meeting **Ellen Hermann** pointed out that carryforward may not be indicative of what is actually available depending on the timing of the fiscal year and when that funding is spent.
      1. **Karen Rowe** said that based on experience, the units typically provide a clarified carryforward as a response to this question (including the base amount and an additional description as to what has already been spent).
   8. **Atreyi Mitra** asked if there should be a question about what the unit has already done to look for alternative sources of funding beyond SFAC funding. While many departments are already underfunded, it may be helpful to see if they have taken the initiative to look for other funds. She added that perhaps there should be a question that asks the units to address how increases in spending may not be sustainable. Also, another question about why the community of students that the unit is serving needs additional support right now and if there are any unique circumstances that the committee should be aware of.
   9. **Kevin Kilgore** added that the committee should consider asking if the units have applied for grants, and if so, what have they applied, what has been approved, and what amounts have they received.
      1. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** asked if a question about grants is helpful because it may be interpreted as though the committee is punishing those units who have already been proactive and received grants.
      2. **Karen Rowe** stated that in previous years, she felt the committeemissed a total picture of funding sources for units and she would want to know information about a unit’s revenue, income, grants, etc. For instance, many units get allocations from Chancellor’s funds or similar sources and the committee only belatedly starts to get a sense of the totality of the funding now.
      3. **Kevin Kilgore** stated that he is concerned with these lines of questions and questions pertaining to grant funding because there are many alternative resources that have specified requirements as to where exactly that money can be spent.
      4. **Karen Rowe** shared thatthe BruinCorps unit had a five-year grant and was asking the SFAC committee for supplemental funding for an administrative position. The additional grant information that BruinCorps shared was helpful and showed the committee how much of the grant funded that position and when the grant was set to terminate.
      5. **Denise Marshall** said that although she does not want a department to feel that the SFAC committee is scrutinizing their funding and spending, she does want them to understand how limited this year’s funding is.
   10. **Denise Marshall** said that last year, the SFAC committee was concerned about carryforward spending. She suggested that the committee asks a question this year to follow up on that carryforward spending this year.
       1. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** asked how the committee is able to determine if the carryforward line item provided in a trend report is carryforward left over from SFAC funding?
       2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said the committee can ask **Ellen Hermann** additional questions about trend reports, but she is unsure if that level of specificity pertaining to carryforward is possible. Instead, she suggested that the SFAC committee ask units for clarification about their carryforward and look at long term trends in carryforward amounts for a given unit.
       3. **Christine Wilson** said that the Office of Academic Planning and Budget (APB) cannot look at specific unit’s ledgers and determine if the money left over came from a specific allocation. However, most departments assign a project code to each set of money and that information can be used to determine how it was spent.
       4. **Karen Rowe** said there were several instances last year in which there was an assumption that SFAC funds could be redistributed at the unit’s discretion. It is an issue when units do not spend SFAC funds in the way that they originally stated.
   11. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked about the question, “What student services are provided by your campus entity through the use of SSF funds? What impacts and outcomes have occurred as a result? (400 words max.)”
       1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that this question helps all SFAC committee members, especially the newer members, better understand the units.
   12. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked about the question, “How many students utilize your SSF-funded services each academic year? Do your services target specific populations of students? If so, what are those populations and why? (200 words max.)”
       1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked **Janay Williams** to clarify her suggested amendments to this question.
       2. **Janay Williams** suggested changing the last piece of the question to “If so, what are those populations and their needs?”
   13. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked about the question, “Please provide an organization chart of your campus entity. This chart should include which positions are career, contract, or student, and whether each position is funded by SSF or another source. For the contract positions funded by SSF, indicate how long the incumbent has been in this position. For student positions, indicate whether you utilize work-study funding. (200 words max.)”
       1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that work-study funding was important to understand last year. This year, the committee may need to ask units to break down additional details about how they hire work-study students, their hourly wages, etc. to better understand their requests.
       2. **Kevin Kilgore** asked why the committee needs to know “how long the incumbent has been in this position.”
          1. **Carina Salazar** said that her department has hired a number of students this year to support their work. However, those students have only been hired for a month at this point. She said she is unsure if the answer to this question would imply they those roles are not important.
          2. **Karen Rowe** said this part of the question is aimed at incumbent positions that are either contract or career. Units have approached the SFAC committee for funding for a position because Human Resources has told the unit that they may not keep a particular contract past 6 years without permanent funding. **Karen Rowe** suggested that the committee should be clear with units that there is no possibility of a conversion of temporary to permanent funding at this point.
          3. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** stated that she does not believe this question allows committee members to understand the stability of a position because people leave positions for a variety of reasons.
             1. **Karen Rowe** said that this question enables the committee to highlight critical positions that should not be funded by SFAC temporary funding (and should instead receive funding from other sources).
          4. **Christine Wilson** said that there is not a situation in which temporary funding transitions into permanent funding. In a previous year, there was permanent funding available to take over the temporary funding because of the increase in the Student Services Fee, but that is not the case now. Most Student Affairs units have SFAC funds, including permanent and temporary funds. There are abilities for departments to permanentize funds. Units may refer to temporary funds now as “SFAC funds,” but it is important for the committee to help units understand that SFAC funds include permanent and temporary funds.
             1. **Karen Rowe** said the problem is that units request SFAC permanent funding in order to permanentize a position. There is confusion and the committee need to clarify that units cannot request permanent funding.
          5. **Nicole Corona Diaz** brought up the idea that the committee could refer to both SSF funds and “20,000” funds together in writing to units to clarify that it includes both permanent and temporary funds.
             1. **Christine Wilson** advised that the committee should encourage units to look at the totality of their budgets. In previous years, before the campus experienced over-enrollment, units’ budgets only consisted of permanent SFAC funds. Now, they think of SFAC funding as only temporary funding that they request.
       3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked about the question, “What role do students play in the delivery of your SSF-funded services? (200 words max.)”
          1. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** asked if this question was redundant and if perhaps it should be deleted because it appears to be unhelpful.
       4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked about the question, “How do students learn about your SSF-funded services? (200 words max.)” She clarified that this question is typically aimed at better understanding a unit’s promotional materials.
          1. **Karen Rowe** reminded the group that this question may already be encompassed in a question in the compilation that asks, “Briefly explain your unit’s use of current technology.” She suggested changing this to ask what technologies the units use to advertise and deliver services.
          2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** removed this question from the list.
       5. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked about the question, “How are your SSF-funded services evaluated, and what role do students play in the assessment process? Please include findings from your assessment(s) (e.g., from SAIRO or equivalent) as attachments. Describe how these findings have been utilized to improve your services. (200 words max.)”
          1. **Atreyi Mitra** asked to clarify what is meant by, “What role do students play in the assessment process?”
          2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** clarified that this question is generally asking about surveys that units ask students to complete and student feedback.
          3. **Carina Salazar** said that the first part of the question (“How are your SSF-funded services evaluated?”) should be sufficient without asking about student involvement. The committee should not lead units to say that students provide feedback if that is not the case.
          4. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** asked how this question differs from the second part of question one (“What impacts and outcomes have occurred as a result [of the student services provided by the campus entity]?).
             1. **Janay Williams** said that the first question is mainly concerned with impacts and outcomes while this question specifically asks about what students think.
       6. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked about the question, “How has your campus entity adjusted to the changes in student enrollment, demographics, etc.? (200 words max.)” She stated that previous unit responses to this question are typically repetitive.
          1. **Atreyi Mitra** asked if the committee could add language about campus climate or political climate to account for students that might be especially impacted by recent political events.
          2. **Kevin Kilgore** said that the content of this question may be covered in several other questions and asking it again may be repetitive.
       7. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked about the question, “Please review the attached “SSF Actual Trend Report” for your campus entity. Explain any changes in overall revenue, overall compensation, and overall expenditures. (150 words max.)”
          1. **Karen Rowe** expressed concern that the question is not asking for a breakdown of the unit’s overall total budget including other revenue sources, grants, etc. Last year, that information would have been helpful because the committee later discovered that some units had huge revenue sources and were still asking the SFAC committee for large allocations. In tight budget times, we may need to put more pressure on revenue-generating units.
          2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** clarified that the suggestion from **Karen Rowe** is to add a line to the question to ask about other funding sources and amounts.
          3. **Karen Rowe** said that the trend report breaks down by budget categories, but those categories do not always capture the picture of how permanent budget is allocated.
          4. **Christine Wilson** said that providing a breakdown of permanent budget categories in more detail should be manageable for a department to provide. She added that **Ellen Hermann** could easily provide this information and she could breakdown details about positions that were funded.
          5. **Karen Rowe** suggested that the committee add “other revenue sources, grants, sales and service” to the question.
       8. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked about the question, “If you are submitting a request for items that are currently supported by SSF funds for 2018-2019, please explain why SFAC should continue supporting these items. (200 words max.)”
          1. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** asked if previous committees have asked units about long-term projections. She added that perhaps the committee should consider asking about 3-5 year projections and plans.
          2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** clarified that **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** suggested to add, “How do you plan to sustain your programs if you don’t receive funding? ”
          3. **Karen Rowe** suggested starting the question as: “Given only the prospect of current funding and no increases.” She added that it may be helpful to add another global question like: “If you had to review your unit’s entire budget, how would you plan for a 50% decrease in temporary funding from SFAC?”
             1. **Carina Salazar** suggested that the committee add the suggested question from **Karen Rowe** as a recommendation in the call letter rather than stating it as a question.
          4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that in previous years, there have been similar questions and responses were vague and unhelpful. Adding this as a statement in the call letter rather than a question would be more helpful.
   14. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that at next week’s meeting, the committee will have a nearly finalized draft of unit review questions to review before sending to units.
7. **SSF Funding Priorities Discussion**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the floor to discuss SSF Funding Priorities for the year. She reviewed several possible budget categories that the committee can provide to units in order to clarify which categories the SFAC committee will consider requests for. Potential budget categories included:
      1. Salaries/Wages (Non-Student)
      2. Benefits (Non-Student)
      3. TIF (Technology Infrastructure Fee) (Non-Student)
      4. Salaries/Wages (Student)
      5. Benefits (Student)
      6. TIF (Technology Infrastructure Fee) (Student)
      7. Marketing/Promotional Materials
      8. Food/Refreshments
      9. Office Supplies/Equipment
      10. Computer Software/Audio-Video Materials
      11. Speaker Honorarium
      12. Communication/Mail
      13. Transportation
      14. Facilities/Equipment Rental
      15. Other
   2. **Karen Rowe** stated that the previous SFAC committee eliminated items vii through xv from the SSF Funding Priorities list for 2020-2021.
   3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** Christine reviewed that Graduate Division said...
      1. **Karen Rowe** clarified that honorarium had been eliminated from this list because bringing in outside speakers and paying for items such as flights and hotels, especially in tight budget years, is not feasible. There is a level of expertise that is local to UCLA and Los Angeles that can be utilized for speaking engagements to avoid these costs.
   4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated thatevery year, when the committee receives submissions, they are received as either new requests or continuing requests. She asked committee members if both types of requests should be considered this year? Or should the committee disregard new requests and only consider funding continuing requests? She said that accepting new requests “opens doors” for new ideas, some of which may be beneficial.
      1. **Karen Rowe** stated that she believes the previous year’s committee did not accept any new requests.
      2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** added that the committeecould consider adding a clause that states that new requests will only be considered on a case by case basis. This would account for programs that may have been discontinued. Completely closing the door on new requests would eliminate the possibility of new, better programs from being funded.
      3. **Karen Rowe** said that she thinks it is important that committee is clear that new requests should be replacing an existing program. A new request should be deemed a higher priority than an existing program because by funding a new request, the committee will be asking units to cut existing programs by severe amounts.
      4. **Christine Wilson** said that the committee can be creative with how they phrase this to units. The committee can let units describe what they would like to do with their allocated temporary funding, regardless of how it has been used in the past. Perhaps, the committee should consider a lot of different options given the new challenges in funding this year; it is never the SFAC committee’s job to micromanage.
   5. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that in the interest of time, items vii through xv from the potential SSF Funding Priorities list will be eliminated.
8. **Discussion of Call Letter**
   1. N/A
9. **Announcements**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** reported that at the CSF meeting, the council chair stated that there might be an increase in the SSF level. Whether or not that increase will happen will be revealed at the November Regents meeting.
10. **Adjournment** 
    1. **Denise Marshall** moved to adjourn the meeting**. Atreyi Mitra** seconded. With no objections, **Nicole Corona Diaz** adjourned the meeting at 6:31 pm.