**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

**2325 Murphy Hall**

**4:30-6:30 PM**

**Tuesday, March 12, 2019**

**Present:**

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

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

Administration: Mike Cohn, Director of SOLE; Barbara Wilson, UCLA Housing & Hospitality

APB Advisor: Ellen Hermann (Ex-Officio)

SFAC Advisor: Marilyn Alkin (Ex-Officio)

**Absent**:

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

Karen Rowe, Professor

**Call to Order**

* 1. **Jazz Kiang** called the meeting to order at 4:37pm.

1. **Approval of Agenda**
   1. **Jazz Kiang** suggested amending the agenda to move item VII to IV.
   2. **Denise Marshall** moved to approve the amended agenda. **Christina Wang** seconded. With no objections, the agenda was approved by consent.
2. **Review of Handouts**
   1. N/A

1. **Review and Approve Minutes** 
   1. **Javier Rodriguez** moved to review and approve the 03.05.19 minutes at the end of the meeting. **Neemat Abdusemed** seconded. With no objections, the motion passed by consent.
   2. **Javier Rodriguez** amended the 03.05.19 minutes directly on Box and moved to approve the amended minutes. **Zak Fisher** seconded. With no objections, the amended minutes were approved by consent.
2. **Discussion on Charter and By Laws** 
   1. **Jazz Kiang** opened the floor for the committee to discuss the SFAC Charter and Bylaws.
   2. **Zak Fisher** read the following statement:
   3. “Based on the factual record now available on the SFAC site and a copy of the chancellor’s hand-signed letter, we believe that the Chancellor did not follow the Bylaws that bind him and the committee. Specifically, Chancellor Block did not take action within 14 days of the committee’s vote to codify the Bylaws language regarding conflicts of interest. That language was approved on a 9-3 vote and therefore made valid on May 22, 2017. The Chancellor also failed to follow the Bylaws when he did not hold the requisite meeting with at least a quorum of the committee (as far as we can tell based on public record). One member of the 2017-2018 SFAC sent a letter opposing the Bylaws Amendment, and Chancellor Block mentions this letter in his August 2017 letter. It is unclear, however, how either the student’s letter or the Chancellor’s response could have effectively revoked the duly passed Bylaws amendment. Article V of our Bylaws is not ambiguous. The Chancellor has the power to disapprove of Bylaw Amendments, but only after he follows certain procedures. In this case, that attempted disapproval had dual infirmities. 1) The attempted disapproval was made after 14 days and 2) the attempted disapproval happened without consulting the committee in discussion. Either one of these violations ought to render the disapproval moot. We believe the immediate effect of this violation is that the Bylaw amendment is now binding and technically has been effective since the Chancellor failed to act in accordance with our Bylaws in his attempt to disapprove. Unfortunately, we cannot find the language that was voted on because it does not appear to be available on the SFAC website. We ask our Advisor for the language today, as we believe the language binds us and we need to start operating in compliance with it immediately.”
3. **Unit Presentation: Dashew Center** 
   1. **Jazz Kiang** opened the floor for Amy Pojar and Sam Nahidi to discuss on the Dashew Center for International Students and Scholars (DCISS) Presentation on (PPT)
   2. DCISS – Who, What and Why
      1. Visa Services – International Students
      2. Case Management – All Students
      3. Programs – All Students (Usually)
      4. Workshops - International Students (Usually)
      5. Training – Students, Staff and Faculty
      6. Internationalization support (direct)
      7. Connect participants across difference – benefit international students & domestic students (explain & predict)
      8. Skills and information for success at UCLA (international students)
      9. Equipping campus to serve international population & effective multicultural communication
   3. Departmental Outcomes
      1. International students and scholars will develop the knowledge and skills needed to integrate and thrive at UCLA and in Los Angeles.
      2. International students and scholars will feel supported, empowered, and confident to make decisions about their visa status, education, engagement opportunities, and career trajectory.
      3. Departmental staff will gather knowledge and develop processes that enable UCLA to admit, appoint, or employ students, scholars, faculty, and staff from around the world to ensure UCLA remains a world class university.
      4. All constituents will approach intercultural interactions with skill, openness, and understanding in order to actively include and support UCLA's vibrant multicultural community.
   4. Visa Services
      1. Counseling – Maintaining visa status and beyond
      2. Documents – Eligibility and support
      3. Authorization – Start/End date changes, enrollment interruptions, work/internships, travel outside U.S.
   5. Programs and Workshops
      1. istart@UCLA
      2. Peer-to-Peer Programs
         1. Int’l Student Ambassadors
         2. Language Exchange
         3. Global Siblings
         4. English Language Circles
      3. Networking and Socio-Cultural Events
         1. World Café
         2. Int’l Speed Dating
         3. UCLA After Hours
      4. Trips
         1. Getting to know LA and beyond
      5. Workshops
         1. Health & Wellness
         2. Academic & Writing
         3. Financial Wellness
         4. Career Development
         5. Dialogue
      6. Information and resources, learning and leadership opportunities (global sibs coordinators, ambassadors – committees centered around issues they care about)
      7. Connect across cultural difference
         1. good for international students: provides support for navigating this new environment
         2. Good for domestic counterparts – intercultural exchange
   6. Training
      1. Colleague Training
         1. Building capacity for UCLA to serve, educate, and engage the international community
      2. Intercultural Communication (Students)
      3. Pronouncing Chinese Names
         1. Creating an inclusive, culturally competent, open global community
      4. Storytelling and Research Internship
         1. Developing young researchers, storytellers, and highlighting diverse student stories
      5. Visa Training for SAOs and Department Staff
   7. Utilization
      1. Over 12,000 international students & scholars from over 120 countries around the world
      2. TOP 10 in the U.S. for International Enrollment
         1. 17,068 DCISS programs (7942 unique users) (2017-2018)
         2. 34,885 DCISS Appointments/Consultations (2015-2016)
         3. Over 50,000 Contacts
   8. Visa Services
      1. 91% of respondents agreed that visa counselors took the time to understand their needs and concerns (n = 515)
      2. 92% of all respondents agreed that the counselor they worked with explained their options and information in a respectful manner (n =514)
      3. 90% of all respondents agreed that the counselor they worked with was able to help resolve their issue and provide them with clear instructions regarding next steps the student or scholar needed to take (n = 518)
   9. Programs
      1. 91% of all attendees meet at least one new person at our programs/events (2014-15 Survey)
      2. 65% of all attendees connect later with at least one person they met (2014-15 Survey)
      3. 82% of students and scholars who attended a Dashew Center program found that it provided them with opportunities to interact with those who did not share their cultural or national background (2016-17 Survey)
   10. Training
       1. % of respondents reporting training is “Very effective” or “Effective” on the following learning outcomes:
       2. 97% Understand key concepts of intercultural communication (n = 92)
       3. 98% Identify how culture may affect interactions between members of UCLA’s multicultural community (n = 92)
       4. 96% Develop new strategies to approach real-life intercultural interactions with skill, openness, and understanding (n = 92)
       5. 97% Identify best practices that support & empower international students (n = 60)
   11. Various Units
       1. Visa Services
       2. Programming
       3. Research & Special Projects
   12. Outcomes
       1. Professional
       2. Personal
       3. Academic
   13. **Jazz Kiang** opened the floor for questions.
   14. **Barbara Wilson** asked why international students are ineligible for work study. Amy Pojar responded that work study students must fill out a FAFSA, which requires either a social security number or eligibility as a noncitizen. There are often a lot of logistical challenges with tax forms for different countries.
   15. **Neemat Abdusemed** asked about the revenue from sales and services. Sam Nahidi responded that there are Visa services that are not covered by SSF and that are available for recent graduates and students of programs that do not get charged SSF. For them to sustain their services, there has to be a separate charge.
   16. **Neemat Abdusemed** asked about orientation for incoming international students. Sam Nahidi responded that they are obligated by the federal government to do an orientation. The previous Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs also requested that international students have a training when they enter UCLA.
   17. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked why international students are charged an iStart fee. Sam Nahidi responded that the fee was implemented in 2011. Again, there are charges that are not covered by SSF. However, since 2011, the fee has increased but their office has been subsidizing the difference. If they did not charge a fee for this program, other programs would be eliminated. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked if they were using iStart funds to cover other programs. Sam Nahidi responded yes. Amy Pojar added that iStart needs to be revamped every year. Currently there are 5 modules. There are multiple staff members that have to keep this updated, which takes a lot of time.
4. **Unit Presentation: Transportation** 
   1. **Jazz Kiang** opened the floor for Clinton Bench, Director of Fleet and Transit and Connie Englert, General Manager, and Byron Mayhan to present on Transportation (presentation on PPT)
   2. UCLA ADA Paratransit Program Enhancements - Delivering On The Promise
   3. Mission
      1. UCLA Transportation and its Fleet & Transit Division operates and/or coordinates most passenger transportation on and off campus through its scheduled BruinBus routes U1-U7, and its special operations with various campus organizations
      2. Safe Ride evolved from the UCPD/CSO Evening Van Service, providing on demand pickup
   4. Phase 2 – Safe Ride
      1. Students had raised concerns in 2017 about long wait times and unknown arrival status for CSO Evening Van service; student assault exacerbated the situation
      2. SFAC engagement began in 2017 with a $43,243 two-year pilot project to offer technology assisted ride hail and service status technologies
      3. SFAC funds allowed UCLA Transportation and UCPD to expand a pilot test of a ride request app for 2018-2019
      4. Worked with USAC to review the effectiveness of the new app and make necessary changes to improve reliability
      5. Rebranded CSO Evening Van as UCLA Safe Ride and created smartphone app.
      6. With substantial work, this phase is largely complete and functional, though work remains for CSO dispatch and reducing cancellation rates
      7. Safe Ride has met its objective to reduce dispatch times from manual telephone dispatch, provide real-time service status, and enhance service performance metrics
      8. Completed rides have increased by 14% since 2017 to 24,000 annual trips
      9. Average wait times is 9:12 minutes per completed ride
   5. Phase 2 – BruinAccess
      1. Campus Entity - UCLA Transit Services( Org ID 3335) in collaboration with the Center for Accessible Education (CAE)
      2. Entity Location -11075 Kinross Ave , Los Angeles, Ca 90095
      3. Name of Program - BruinACCESS: Enhanced ADA Paratransit Mobility Services
      4. Type of Request - New Request
      5. Requested Amount
         1. AY 19-20: $28,365
         2. AY 20-21: $29,216
         3. Project Total: $57,306
   6. Program Purpose
      1. Existing Center for Accessible Education (CAE) accessible van service only provides rides to students traveling to or from classes or class-based activities ONLY. Funding sources place these restrictions on use of current funding
      2. Over 2,000 students are approved for CAE services for various and medically substantiated needs, either temporary or permanent. Services are offered with a single accessible van
      3. Students with disabilities have unreasonable barriers to engaging in club, athletics, social, and other activities that enhance the UCLA experience and aligns with our core values due to funding restrictions
   7. Phase 2 Overview
      1. Builds off the earlier Phase I technology investments
      2. Services would be free to all qualified participants – same as BruinBus fixed routes
      3. Two vehicles would be available instead of one, and hours would be expanded from 7:00 AM-8:00 PM to mimic BruinBus route services (during academic periods initially)
      4. All BruinACCESS service would continue to be staffed and operated by highly trained and committed student operators, supervised by BruinBus management
   8. SFAC Funding Request:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project: BruinACCESS Enhanced Paratransit Service** | |  |
| Budget Element | AY20 | AY21 |
| 1. Salaries/Wages (Non-Student) |  |  |
| 2. Benefits (Non-Student) |  |  |
| 3. TIF (Non-Student) |  |  |
| 4. Salaries/Wages (Student) | $ 19,200 | $ 19,776 |
| 5. Benefits (Student) |  |  |
| 6. TIF (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 | $ 9,165 | $ 9,165 |
| 15. Other |  |  |
| Total | $ 28,365 | $ 28,941 |
| Project Total |  | $ 57,306 |

* 1. Other Funding Commitments
     1. Additional funding sources:
        1. Center for Accessible Education: $35,000
        2. UCLA Transportation/Transit Operations: $65,854
  2. Discussion Points
     1. This project is the only request as it is their highest ranked project with the greatest impact on student life
     2. There are no “carry forward” funds from initial phase
     3. If SFAC funds are unavailable, implementation of expanded services that allow for non-academic trips would likely be delayed (current CAE service would be transferred to Transportation regardless)
     4. Their project is solely focused on providing universal access to all Bruins regardless of their ability to pay
        1. Students from low-income and non-traditional backgrounds would not require a private lift-equipped car or pay for Uber/Lyft to get to extracurricular activities
     5. ALL Bruins would have access to ALL activities regardless of their abilities or whether they can pay for Uber/Lyft, thereby enhancing career development opportunities (internships, group study, clubs, etc.)
     6. This project leverages earlier SFAC investments in Safe Ride technologies, and allows Transportation to offer a coordinated suite of mobility services (BruinBus, BruinAccess and UCLA Safe Ride).
     7. Provide ALL Bruins with access to all campus wellness and behavioral health services and events regardless of their mobility needs or ability to pay for Uber/Lyft services
  3. **Jazz Kiang** opened the floor for questions.
  4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked about Bruin Access and if two vans are enough.Clinton Bench responded that their sense right now is that it is difficult to feel confident that they will have enough student employees interested in operating the vehicles and to provide a level of service. They are going for an incremental approach because students work limited hours and they are committed to having student employees. Connie Englert added that in addition to Bruin Access, they would like to encourage students to use the new Bruin buses. Demand is likely higher than what two vans can cover, but driving distance is another factor that has to be determined before expansion.
  5. **Neemat Abdusemed** asked if Transportation is absorbing the cost of Safe Ride since it is not a request and SSF had originally funded the pilot program for it. Clinton Bench responded that they are absorbing the cost of Safe Ride. Connie Englert stated that the cost for the software is about $22,000 per year and that students often compare prices and wait time between Safe Ride and Uber/Lyft.
  6. **Denise Marshall** asked about the Bruin Bus route. Connie Englert responded that students at University Village South voted to pay through a contract for that route service.
  7. **Christina Wang** stated that she got to test the Safe Ride app a few years ago while she was a part of the USAC Facilities Commission. She asked if student employees would be specially trained for Bruin Access. Byron Mayhan responded that paratransit training will happen for all student employees as well as other training, like defensive driving.
  8. **Jazz Kiang** asked why Bruin Access is being proposed now and why these expansion efforts had not occurred in previous years. Clinton Bench responded that there is a much bigger focus now on mobility. People can utilize other transportation services, but they can be expensive. UCLA is a growing campus and CAE was finding themselves overwhelmed. Connie Englert responded that they are putting this forward since it is a civil rights issue.

1. **Unit Presentation: Ombuds** 
   1. **Jazz Kiang** opened the floor for Kathleen Canul, Director, to discuss Ombuds (presented on PPT)
   2. Role of and Ombudsperson
      1. Addresses concerns regarding fair and equitable treatment
      2. Keeps all communications confidential and does not serve as notice to the University
      3. Remains impartial and offers informal ways of addressing problems, when appropriate
      4. Operates independently of administrative authority and does not represent the University
      5. Listens compassionately, mediates, explores problem-solving options, researches information and makes referrals
      6. Operates independently of administrative authority and does not represent the University
      7. Listens compassionately, mediates, explores problem-solving options, researches information and makes referrals
   3. The Ombuds Role and Student Success
      1. When students from diverse racial, cultural and socio-economic backgrounds request assistance from the Ombuds Office, their needs are assessed holistically and they are connected to campus resource
      2. When students have their concerns addressed by an ombudsperson, self-efficacy and a sense of community increases thereby enhancing leadership and professional and academic development
      3. There are no equivalent services duplicating the Ombuds role which maximizes the use of funding
      4. Students who utilize Ombuds services will experience decreased stress and isolation
   4. Ombuds receives permanent SSF funds of about $177,000 and no temporary SSF funds.
   5. Jazz Kiang opened the floor for questions.
   6. **Neemat Abdusemed** asked about the confidentially aspect of the services. Kathleen Canul responded that they are a resource center for people who need to express themselves, feel safe about it, and be directed to the resources that they need. In most cases, people who come in will end up reporting their issue. Kathleen Canul added that while Ombuds reports to the Vice Chancellor of Legal Affairs, she has never been deposed or asked for information from administrators regarding a case.
   7. **Christina Wang** asked about overspending as noted on the SSF trend report. Ellen Hermann clarified that the $200 ending deficit is not worrisome from a financial standpoint. Kathleen Canul stated that USC created an Ombuds office recently and hired one of their longtime ombudsmen.
   8. **Paulina Macias** asked how they go about evaluating their services. Kathleen Canul responded that trainings and presentations get evaluated when Ombuds presents at administrative meetings. They are still figuring out how to evaluate more.
   9. **Neemat Abdusemed** asked if they take walk-ins and if they have renovated their space. Kathleen Canul responded that renovations have happened through funding from the Chancellor’s office. They take walk-ins during normal hours and are also flexible to schedule appointments during other hours.
   10. **Jazz Kiang** asked about the history of Ombuds and how it was started. Kathleen Canul responded that April 2020 will be their 50th anniversary. Ombuds started as a civil rights effort for students during the campus unrest of the 1960s and then expanded to supporting faculty and staff.
2. **Announcement**
   1. **Jazz Kiang** reminded the committee that SFAC’s spring quarter meetings will occur on Tuesdays, 4:00-6:00pm at 2325 Murphy Hall. Meetings will begin on Tuesday, April 2.
   2. **Jazz Kiang** asked for committee members to check in with their subcommittees over spring break to begin generating preliminary funding recommendations.
   3. **Jazz Kiang** stated that a new program under the Alumni Association submitted funding requests for “Bruin Connections,” which has its own Box folder. He suggested that the subcommittee with Spirit Squad review their requests.
   4. **Jazz Kiang** stated that he will send out the PRG recommendation letter to the Chancellor this week.
3. **Adjournment** 
   1. **Zak Fisher** moved to adjourn the meeting. **Barbara Wilson** seconded. With no objections, **Jazz Kiang** adjourned the meeting at 6:34pm.