STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

A-239 Murphy Hall

Wednesday, October 15, 2014

**Attendees Present:**

Graduates: Erik Peña, Nicole Robinson, Michael Soh

Undergraduates: Moneel Chand, Alexia Gonzalez, Janay Williams, Angela Yip

Administration: Christine Wilson, Director, GSRC

Maureen Wadleigh, Associate Director, CRA

Nancy Greenstein, Director of Police Community Services

Faculty: Thomas Vondriska, Associate Professor

Advisor: Marilyn Alkin

**Absent**: Theresa Stewart (Chair), Rebecca Lee-Garcia, Academic Planning and Budget (Ex-Officio)

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 4:06 p.m.

1. **Approval of Agenda**
	* 1. A motion was made by ***Nicole Robinson*** to approve the 10/8/2014 agenda and seconded by ***Erik Peña***. This vote was unanimous.
2. **Review of Handouts**
	* + 1. The 2014-15 SFAC Roster
			2. Subcommittee list
			3. The meeting minutes from 10/0/14
		1. No motion necessary
3. **Review of Minutes**
	* 1. A motion was made by ***Nancy Greenstein*** to approve the 10/8/2014 minutes as amended and seconded by ***Angela Yip***. This vote was unanimous.
4. **Unit Review Discussion**
	* 1. ***Maureen Wadleigh*** led the discussion of the Unit Review.
		2. Unit Review subcommittee is responsible for putting together the rubric and sending out the letter and Unit Review for all units. They discussed the purpose, usefulness, how it adds to the work the committee does during the year. They also discussed shifting the timeline, renaming the Unit Review, and its purpose. The Unit Review currently does not tie in well with the Call Letter/Funding Request.
		3. The subcommittee uses the Unit Reviews to see what the Units provide to the students with the funding, the gaps, and what the units are asking funding for. The subcommittee thinks they should consolidate the process to provide the SFAC committee with more time to understand the Units, especially with the committee turnover.
		4. Currently, the Committee doesn’t have the budget information and making determination whether there is sufficient money to put a Call Letter out. Rebecca will present that information next week. The Unit Review subcommittee would like to know when they can suggest a change to the process.
		5. There is disconnect between the Unit Review and the Call Letter due to the amount of reading in each subcommittee.
		6. ***Janay Williams*** explained the purpose of Unit Review was educational for the committee. Splitting it into two parts. Part A is the Unit Review for each unit will do every year. Part B is submitting a funding request (also known as the Call Letter). The Unit Review subcommittee proposes a different Unit Review process to show what the Units are doing and what the funding priorities are. When Units answer the Unit Review questions, they are similar to the Funding Request (Call Letter) questions. The proposed new way provides a combined process of both Unit Reviews and Funding Request.
		7. Marilyn Alkin stated that she noticed there was a shift in language from the Call Letter to Funding Request.
		8. ***Thomas Vondriska*** asked the question about how information about how student fees are spent in the SFAC is shared to the larger student body. ***Janay Williams*** stated that the student representatives have office hours but don’t have too many people stop by the office hours. Nancy suggested to add this topic to next week’s agenda.
		9. ***Janay Williams*** explained that originally Unit Reviews were in fall quarter and Call Letters sent in winter quarter. In the new combined process SFAC would send out the Unit Review by fall week 7 (or earlier) and due by winter quarter week 5. Or SFAC could send Unit Reviews out winter quarter week 2 and receive them back week 9 but that would lead to meeting late night into spring quarter. It will take lots of time to prepare the questions and packet to send it out by fall quarter week 7.
		10. The majority of the committee agreed that they liked this combined process of the Unit Review and Funding Request to compare how units think they are doing, what working on and what they want.
		11. ***Maureen Wadleigh*** suggested creating a consistent executive summary with specific questions that needed to be addressed by SFAC members when processing the Unit Review and Funding Request to share with the SFAC Committee, then proceed to dialogue. The committee liked this idea.
		12. ***Maureen Wadleigh*** also asked the question on how the committee members communicate with individual Units during the Unit Review process. She suggested communicating in person rather than email communication.
		13. ***Janay Williams*** suggested having the Unit Review and Call Letter subcommittees meet together to discuss a timeline and create a plan. The subcommittees included all of SFAC except for ***Erik Peña*** and ***Angela Yip,*** however, they were both invited to stay. ***Janay Williams*** suggested that everyone meet today after the meeting adjourns. This is in the planning stage but the committee did not want to vote on this new process.
5. **Announcements**
	* 1. Next week on 10/22/14, there will be a budget presentation by ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia.***
		2. CSF Bylaw Charter changes explained by ***Moneel Chand***. Memorandum of Understanding between the CSF and UCSA (University of California Student Association) stating CSF will deal with campus base fees, student service fees, including referendums which is out of the jurisdiction of UCSA.
			1. Article 2 amends the jurisdiction of campus based fees
				1. Problematic for UCLA because student government handles the campus based referendums. ASUCLA is independent and is separate because it is almost independently funded. UCLA SFAC is only over Student Services Fee. Therefore, this article will not impact how SFAC at UCLA operates. ***Moneel Chand*** recommends that UCLA SFAC members at the CSF meeting abstain to vote on Article 2 and 3’s revisions because the revisions are a conflict of interest with UCLA’s campus which should be explained at the meeting.
			2. Article 3 campus based fees and student services fees and its jurisdiction
			3. Article 5 stated that the minimum operating procedure for CSF went from 3 meetings per year because summer was not considered a real meeting but this year, they are solidifying the meeting to 4 per year.
			4. There needs to be a SFAC campus vote by 10/25/14. ***Christine Wilson*** and ***Angela Yip*** suggested waiting on voting in order to compare the previous Charter to the current language. This item will be added to the next agenda.
		3. Compensation paperwork needs to be completed with Nadene MacDonald who sent information via email
6. **Adjournment**
	* 1. Motion was made by ***Janay Williams*** and seconded by ***Nicole Robinson*** to adjourn the meeting. This vote was unanimous.
		2. Meeting was adjourned at 4:55pm.