**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

**Murphy Hall Room 2206 from 4:30-6:30pm**

**Tuesday, October 29, 2019**

**Present:**

Graduates: Janay Williams, Brittnee Meitzenheimer, Denise Marshall

Undergraduates: Nicole Corona Diaz (Chair), Atreyi Mitra, Paulina Macias

Administration: Carina Salazar, Associate Director, Career Center, Kevin Kilgore, Police Lieutenant, UCPD, Deb Geller, Associate Dean of Students

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)

APB Advisor: Ellen Hermann (Ex-Officio)

**Absent:**

N/A

**Call to Order**

1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** called the meeting to order at 4:43pm.
2. **Approval of the Agenda**
   1. **Kevin Kilgore** moved to approve the agenda. **Carina Salazar** seconded. With no objections, the agenda was approved by consent.
3. **Review of Handouts**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that relevant handouts for the meeting were available for the committee to review in Box.
4. **Approval of Minutes**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that approval for minutes from 10.22.19 would be tabled because some edits were still being received and the final version was not ready for approval.
5. **Approval and Discussion of Call Letter**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the floor to discuss the Call Letter. She reminded the group that she sent the committee a preliminary draft of the Call Letter for them to review before today’s meeting. There were several notes on the draft for the committee to review as well. Last year’s Call Letter was quite long, so she created a more condensed version of the document. She also added the preliminary due date of December 16th that the committee discussed. Lastly, for the most part, responses will be sent to **Christine Wilson. Nicole Corona Diaz** said that most of the discussion today might revolve around the priorities for funding that the committee will agree upon.
   2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the draft of the Call Letter document and asked for committee member feedback. Sheread the first part of the document, “Dear Director, The Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) is charged with providing recommendations to the Chancellor on the use of revenue generated from the Student Services Fee. This letter is to provide you with the Student Fee Advisory Committee unit review form, the funding request form, and the spreadsheet. As with last year, we will be asking you to complete the unit review and the funding requests at the same time.”
      1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** reminded the group that they can suggest changes to the names of the forms and documents that they list in this piece.
      2. **Ellen Hermann** said that later in the letter, it also says that the committee will provide a list of categories associated with the spreadsheet. She was unsure if **Nicole Corona Diaz** intends to specifically outline everything that they intend to send or just reference the spreadsheet in this part of the letter.
      3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that last year, APB provided a template to use. She was not sure what exactly would be provided by APB this year.
      4. **Ellen Hermann** said that would be up to the committee. She said that she sent out the spreadsheet to the committee last week. The list included the dropdown of categories on that spreadsheet; she can compile a separate list of those categories if that is helpful. Add “along with a list of expense categories” after “spreadsheet.”
      5. **Christine Wilson** said it is helpful. Last year, Student Affairs asked for even more instructions.
      6. **Ellen Hermann** said she is happy to put that list together. At this point, she has the list from last year’s committee and that list has not changed.
      7. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked what **Ellen** **Hermann** thinks this list should be referred to as in the Call Letter. She suggested adding the phrase “along with a list of funding categories.”
      8. **Deb Geller** suggested the phrase “along with a list of expense categories” because “expense” is more descriptive and appropriate than “funding.” She said it may be helpful to provide more information to units. For example, the committee could remind units that TIF (Technology Infrastructure Fee) is calculated as $540 per FTE per year. The committee could also provide a reminder about the composite benefit rates and minimum wage policies for the relevant years. Providing that information would help units reply with accurate numbers.
         1. **Karen Rowe** said that she has asked for this (additional information or a guideline of relevant information) to be added for two years. This year she is definitely in favor because it is frustrating to compare apples to oranges.
         2. **Ellen Hermann** asked if the committee wanted APB to provide this information.
         3. **Christine Wilson** said that she will send **Ellen Hermann** the information that she created last year so that she can use it as a template to update.
      9. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that she will list anything that the committee would like to attach to the Call Letter in the first paragraph of the document. She reminded the committee that they can change the names of the documents that they list.
         1. **Karen Rowe** said that it helps to capitalize the names of the documents so that they seem more concrete, as if they were the headers of the documents. She also asked about amending the list of expense categories to be limited. She clarified that she wanted to revisit what **Ellen Hermann** was referring to as last year’s list of categories.
         2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that initially, there were cuts to the list of categories. Because every unit’s request will be different, some units might be more dependent on one particular category for certain programs. It may be difficult to cut categories. However, she understands that listing all of the funding categories might allow units to apply to all of those categories. She thinks that because the committee is strategically inputting the budget number that they are working with, hopefully, units will not take advantage of every category because they will know that funding is limited compared to other years. The committee can revisit the category list at a later time; some of the categories may be cut, but not all of them.
   3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** read, “Attached you will find: (1) The Student Fee Funding guidelines (2) The Questionnaire for Student Services Fee Funding (3) The Questionnaire for Student Services Fee Funding Unit Review (4) A Spreadsheet template (5) The approved funding requests from 2020-2021 (6) Your Unit’s Trend Report (7) Etc. Etc. List of Expense Categories”
      1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked if the committee would like to keep the name for item 2, “The Questionnaire for Student Services Fee Funding” as is.
         1. **Deb Geller** suggested that this might make more sense to be phrased as a “request” rather than a “questionnaire.” Perhaps it can be titled “Student Service Fee Funding Request Form.”
         2. **Deb Geller** suggested that item 3, “The Questionnaire for Student Services Fee Funding Unit Review,” could be rephrased to say, “Student Services Fee Funding Unit Review Questionnaire.”
         3. **Deb Geller** suggested that item 4, “A Spreadsheet template,” could instead say, “A Spreadsheet Template for Funding Requests.
            1. **Karen Rowe** said that this makes sense because everything else flows out of funding request.
      2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked if committee wants to keep item 5, “The approved funding requests from 2020-2021." This item was an addition that was suggested last week.
         1. **Ellen Hermann** said that as of now, this information is compiled in a single PDF. It will depend on what the committee would like to send; it is easiest to send the full document to units (which also includes 19-20). However, she can also pull together whatever specific information the committee would like to send.
         2. **Deb Geller** says it makes sense to leave it as a whole, rather than break it down by unit, because it is not sent directly to units. If there is a way to separate the two years that is not too labor-intensive, it would be good to just have 20-21.
         3. **Karen Rowe** said she is unsure if sending all of the units the entire spreadsheet will have the same impact that the committee was intending to have if they instead sent each specific unit a record of their individual funding.
         4. **Ellen Hermann** said that she can create individual documents for the units; it is simply more administrative work for her and Nicole Corona to do this.
         5. **Christine Wilson** said that last year was first year units received individual emails with trend reports. Student Affairs does not necessarily want or require SFAC to send each individual unit information directly. They have people who manage the process and think of it as their job. If it is important for the committee to see individual emails to units, that would be different, but if it is a matter of splitting up information and sending it to individual units, Student Affairs may be able to do that.
            1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked if this is specific to trend report or funding request.
            2. **Christine Wilson** said that she was mainly referring to the trend report.
            3. **Ellen Hermann** said that a lot of times, the numbers in funding requests do not match the numbers in the trend report.
            4. **Christine Wilson** said that many times in her experiences working in a department, those numbers did not match.
            5. **Ellen Hermann** added that she is happy to work with units who have questions about their numbers.
         6. **Karen Rowe** said this committee wants units to notice approved funding allocations for 2020-2021. That means that emails to units in Student Affairs could go en mass and those units that are not in Student Affairs (e.g. CTO) could be sent individually.
            1. **Christine Wilson** said that whatever **Ellen Hermann** can do easily that saves time is great. It may be better if she is able to produce lists of approved requests for individual units.
            2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said it is not challenging to send information to units individually. It might be helpful to them. At least the units will know what the committee has been looking at and they can answer questions based off of that.
         7. **Deb Geller** said that there are pros and cons. The pros of sending information individually to units include everyone gets information at the same time and has the same full amount of time to review and review (as opposed to having to wait for it to come through leadership). The con is that the organizational leadership may not prefer that. She might suggest that before sending it to the units directly, the committee should check-in with organizational leaders to see if they have any objections to the committee sending these documents directly to unit heads.
            1. **Karen Rowe** asked why these leaders might have objections.
            2. **Deb Geller** said that they may want to add additional criteria or process overlaid on top of this. If they want more control or restriction to stick with priorities or other things that we may not be aware of, they may not want people to start work outside of the scope of any additional restrictions that they may want to impose in order to recognize the need for SFAC.
            3. **Carina Salazar** said that it would be good thing for SFAC.
            4. **Karen Rowe** agreed that this would be good for SFAC if they are explicit enough about the need to impose restrictions..
            5. **Christine Wilson** said that, historically, there has been student objection to having divisions and schools control the application process because it could lead to requests that the students want to see not coming forward.
            6. **Janay Williams** said that she understands why leadership might want to be a part of this process, but she emphasized that SFAC is a student majority committee. It is up to the committee (students) to set trends of what priorities are, not administrators. It is up to students to make major decisions as to what the students are using and where this money should be going. So, she would object to sending this to higher-ups because it invalidates a lot of this process. There is a reason that this committee exists so that the Chancellor knows what the students think the priorities are.
   4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** read, “Please note the following: (1) All entities that currently receive SSF funds—including those who do not plan to submit funding requests—must answer the “ Student Services Fee Unit Review Questionnaire” (2) Any units making requests are required to complete the “Questionnaire for Student Services Fee Funding” (3) SFAC will review a compiled “SSF Actual Trend Report” for each entity, along with all other submitted materials.”
      1. **Karen Rowe** asked about the guidelines (TIFs, minimum wage, etc.) that the committee discussed earlier in the meeting, how they would refer to those guidelines in the letter, and where they might be included in this language.
         1. **Ellen Hermann** said that theycould refer to them as “expense categories and guidelines.” Or, the committee could provide the list of categories separately from the guidlines.
         2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that they could phrase it as “guidelines for funding requests related to wages.” She asked if the guidelines were only about wages.
         3. **Ellen Hermann** said the guidelines were mostly about wages and benefits, although TIF is not technically about wages.
      2. **Christine Wilson** asked about how in previous years, Student Affairs asked units to separate TIF out and later asked to put it back together. She was unsure why they asked this.
         1. **Deb Geller** said that TIF is a set rate. It changes annually, it is currently $540 per year per FTE. We had a practice of requesting $1500 per FTE to cover TIF and the other operational overhead-type expenses that come with having staff (for example paper, business cards, phones, training for essential responsibilities). Last year, the thought was to call it as it is: $540 for TIF and $960 for operational overhead, but then Student Affairs was doing it differently than other organizations on campus. So, the thought became- no, let’s go back to $1500 per FTE knowing that part of it is TIF and part of it is those other types of expenses so that we can be consistent with other organizations on campus.
         2. **Christine Wilson** asked about how that decision affected the committee’s ability to review proposals.
         3. **Karen Rowe** said that she did not realize that $1500 included overhead and operational expenses and training expenses. It would have made her look more carefully at other requests that then came in for training that were separated out. If this $1500 amount covers things like personnel training (other than acclimation to the job, but instead ongoing training), then why was the committee receiving requests for special training.
         4. **Deb Geller** said that perhaps “training” was not the correct word to use in describing what this money goes towards. For example, if you look at a person who has a phone on their desk, it costs ~$30 per month. Now, you have $500 left; in years where the general liability insurance was not paid from a central fund, that’s part of it (that’s about 1% of payroll). If you get someone business cards, that’s approximately $30. Now we’re down to $200-300 and that amount is not professional development. That might be used for a class from Campus Human Resources for a skill that’s necessary for the jobs.
         5. **Ellen Hermann** said that as **Nicole Corona Diaz** brought up last week, if the committee is reviewing units in a holistic way, it may not be necessary to get that level of detail anymore.
      3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that it is difficult to assess how many requests they will get. The committee will tell units the amount of funding that they have to work with, but they still do not know how units will respond. Because the committee cannot foresee this, these guidelines may be something worth including. It may still be helpful to have a breakdown.
         1. **Atreyi Mitra** said that she agrees that it could be helpful to include these guidelines. It was mentioned that there were discrepancies with the information that units were using before (e.g. minimum wage rates). Including guidelines would minimize trouble on our end and maybe, it could help units better understand.
      4. **Karen Rowe** asked to clarify if TIF applies to student workers.
         1. **Deb Geller** said it applies to everyone, it is applied per Full Time Equivalent (FTE), not per person.
         2. **Karen Rowe** said that they ran into issues when the committee received proposals for student workers who were not working 40 hours per week, but instead maybe 10 hours per week. The committee needs guidelines. Subcommittees had trouble last year because things were not adding up.
         3. **Deb Geller** asked if there is there a way to ask, “if you’re asking for funding for student staff, identify the number of hours worked per week, weeks per year, and hourly rate.” Perhaps that kind of question can help the committee with math.
         4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that they can include this in the guidelines.
         5. **Karen Rowe** said one issue that the committee has encountered is when units saying students were working 52 weeks per year. That is not possible.
            1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said they can include a note in the instructions to remind units that not all of the weeks in the year are worked by students.
            2. **Deb Geller** said without holidays and the closure, it is fewer than 52 weeks (closer to a maximum of 48 weeks per year).
            3. **Karen Rowe** said that usually, students work 3 quarters, not inclusive of exam weeks.

**Deb Geller** said many students work during breaks and finals, but they do not work during winter closure.

* + 1. **Ellen Hermann** asked if this piece should also ask units to complete the spreadsheet as well. It may make sense to spell it out for them.
       1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** added “in addition to the Spreadsheet Template” to item 2.
    2. **Ellen Hermann** said the committee could add a piece that directs units to APB (with **Ellen Hermann** being the contact) for questions about the Trend Report. She is happy to work with units to better understand that information.
       1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that she will add a note about that at the bottom of the letter.
  1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** read, “SFAC will not bring campus entities for an in-person presentation. If SFAC needs additional information for clarification, we will contact you by email and will expect a prompt response. If SFAC feels an in person meeting is needed, you may be invited to a committee meeting to respond to SFAC’s questions.”
     1. No one on the committee suggested changes to this piece.
  2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** read, “There will be no increase to SSF Level for the 2020-2021 year and we have to make our 2021-2022 recommendations with the assumption that there will be no SSF increase. SFAC has determined that it can recommend between $1.6m and $2m in temporary funding in total for 2020-2021 and 2021-2022. Therefore, the committee does not anticipate recommending additional funding allocations for the 2020-2021. Units may submit requests under extraordinary circumstances; however, it is unlikely that the committee will consider them. Please keep in mind that the total amount of temporary SSF funds allocated for 2021-2022 will be less than 50% of the total temporary SSF funds allocated for 2020-2021 and about one-third of the funds allocated for the current year.”
     1. **Karen Rowe** said to add “Fee” between SSF and Level in first statement to clarify.
     2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said the committee talked about not considering additional requests for 2020-2021 year, but she thinks it is important that they discuss what might happen if there is an increase in funding. In that situation, will the committee consider revisiting the 2020-2021 year? She asked if anyone on the committee had a change in opinion. It should be noted that if there is an increase, it would only increase funding for 2021-2022 year. With that in mind, she asked if the committee wanted to move forward with not considering 2020-2021 year.
        1. **Atreyi Mitra** said the committee should focus on 2021-2022. Assuming an increase happened, it would be 3% increase. That would translate to just over $1 million. If this additional money went to the latter pot, it would not be that much more. That pool is already so small, moving money elsewhere would put units in a more challenging situation
        2. **Denise Marshall** said that she thinks both years should have funds, but she wants to ensure that both years at least have a solid amount of funding to start with.
        3. **Atreyi Mitra** said an increase in SSF is based on a situation that might not happen. It is not worth the risk to consider funding for 2020-2021 if an increase does not happen.
        4. **Janay Williams** said the funds that are already allocated for 2020-2021 should be sufficient.
        5. **Ellen Hermann** reminded the committee that not everything that the previous SFAC committee may have wanted to be funded was funded. It is important to keep that in mind. In some cases, the committee may have wanted this year’s committee to review something that they weren’t able to recommend funding for.
        6. **Deb Geller** said that there were a lot of items that couldn’t be funded for a second year because there was not enough money to do so. If we add nothing more to 20-21, the committee will still fund less than half in 21-22 than what was funded in 20-21. Every dollar that is added to 2020-2021 is a dollar that cannot be added to 2021-2022; it makes the difference between the years that much more severe. Both because we are taking the money out, so it doesn’t have a year to grow, and because it is then a smaller pot compared to an even larger pot. Good, bad, or ugly, if we respect decisions made last year as priorities and just focused on next year out, it will still be a significant reduction.
        7. **Janay Williams** suggested that the committee could consider the idea of internally expecting ~80% of the funding should go to 2021-2022. If committee members from last year are saying that there were requests that weren’t funded last year that were really good, it may be worth saving a small amount for those requests.
        8. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that the language in the Call Letter draft does not encourage requesting funding for 2020-2021, but it does allow for those requests if units really need it.
        9. **Deb Geller** said that there is a bit of naiveté in this assumption. If units really need the funding, they will ask for items regardless. Everyone is going to think that having been denied is an exceptional circumstance. If the committee moves forward with this, we can anticipate getting $3-6 million in requests for 2020-2021.
        10. **Janay Williams** said if the committee moves forward with this idea, she does not anticipate anyone asking for less funding. The more leeway the committee gives, the more they leave that door open. That, in turn, makes the committee’s job harder because then they are required to comb through more requests to try and figure out what the priorities are. However, the alternative is to cut everyone out of getting any additional funding for 2020-2021.
            1. **Karen Rowe** asked if **Janay Williams** was arguing for eliminating the phrase, “units may submit requests under extraordinary circumstances”?
            2. **Janay Williams** replied to **Karen Rowe** and said that it is difficult to gauge because she want not on last year’s committee and does not know what was and was not funded last year. So it is hard to simply say no to all of that. However, to make our jobs a little easier in determining what the priorities are, if most of the money the committee allocates is for 2021-2022, that might be the better thing to do. For 2020-2021, the committee has already allocated about $2 million. The more we move to 2020-2021, the less we have for 2021-2022.
            3. **Karen Rowe** said she would agree. She is also in support of eliminating the phrase “under extraordinary circumstances” because units can explain the need they felt and put it forward as part of the proposal for 2021-2022. The could say that they prioritize funding in a particular area, for which they received depleted funding last year, because we consider this a priority. That perhaps will help them shape things so that they are more clear about their priorities to the committee. She believes that the committee should not go back and reconsider decisions that have already been made by last year’s committee; this committee needs to move forward.
     3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said there aretwo options on the table. One, the committee could “leave the door open” for units to submit requests, knowing majority of funding will be going to 2021-2022. Two, the committee could *not* include language indicating that they are accepting any 2020-2021 requests. It is up to the committee to decide which option they would like to proceed with. In order to get specific context about last year’s requests would require committee members to review last year’s requests.
        1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee to consider both options and provide an unofficial vote. She recorded no votes in favor of “leaving the door open.” All committee members voted to “close the door” and remove the language indicating that they would consider requests for 2020-2021.
        2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** amended language to remove, “Units may submit requests under extraordinary circumstances; however, it is unlikely that the committee will consider them.” and to change “Therefore, the committee does not anticipate recommending additional funding allocations for the 2020-2021." to “Therefore, the committee will not consider recommending additional funding allocations for the 2020-2021."
        3. **Ellen Hermann** reminded the committee that with this decision, they would be “closing the door” on several items that previous committees have historically funded extensively. Some of those decisions are intentional (for example, the Bruin Resource Center rent was intended to only be a one-year item), but this would mean that the committee is not funding any workstation replacements for anyone in Student Affairs (this was a one-year item) or programming supplies for Campus Assault Resources & Education (CARE). Maybe that is okay with this year’s committee, but as an advisor, she wanted to ensure it was clear that these are items that the committee can no longer recommend funding for in 2020-2021 if they do not allow any requests for 20-21.
           1. **Karen Rowe** said that the committee also cut out categories. For example, they cut out Entertainment.
           2. **Ellen Hermann** clarified that she is only looking at items that the committee funded for one year. So they were important enough to fund for a single year at least. However, now the committee is saying that they will not consider the second year.
           3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that it seems to be a trend that each year, the decisions are rushed. Last year in particular, the way in which the committee handled the across the board cuts was a bit inconsistent. Looking at was and was not funded, the committee could have done a better job to see what was and what was not important. To new committee members who may want more context, they could get more information by looking at last year’s requests and the holes in funding.
           4. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** clarified that the committee would not be closing the door indefinitely, but this would just be for a single year.

**Ellen Hermann** said yes. For example, for one year, the committee would not be funding a licensed physician to help with recreation. She wants to make clear for certain things, for one year, the committee would not be funding them.

* + - * 1. **Christine Wilson** said that when considering the impact on departments and the politics at hand, the committee may regret making such a categorical statement because they have boxed themselves into a corner. Instead, the committee should box units into a corner, not themselves.
        2. **Paulina Macias** suggested instead of asking for recommendations in extreme circumstances, the committee asks units to cut themselves by a certain percentage. That way, the committee does not have to make the decisions for the units.

**Ellen Hermann** said that along those lines, the committee might consider saying that they will only accept one extreme circumstance per unit. Some people may listen, some may still submit ten.

**Janay Williams** suggested saying, “you can only apply 2020-2021 if you have received a one-year allocation for 2019-2020.” That would help the committee continue requests, but close the idea on new requests for 2020-2021.

**Ellen Hermann** reminded the committee that to some extent, when you make a categorical cut, it limits what it can recommend to the Chancellor. You need to weigh this with how much time you can spend on reviewing requests that you cannot fund.

* + - * 1. **Karen Rowe** said she believes the committee is confusing categories, it is like comparing apples to oranges. The across-the-board cuts were in categories and were applied to virtually all units. However, what we are referring to in terms of these one-time allocations, were very specifically determined by reviewed by subcommittees. For example, they reviewed and said no to funding a second year for a licensed physician. Those were decisions made out of the subcommittees and their recommendations as opposed to what was the wholesale cutting of things like operations. To her, that reflects the committee process. If one was to say that under extreme circumstances or extreme need for units with a one-time or single-year allocation, she understands that. However, what if these units then said “okay, well we need the $100K for a physician.” That’s $100K.

**Ellen Hermann** said that she is not trying to imply that any of these requests will be any cheaper this year. She wanted to remind the committee that they are considering closing the door on items that last year’s committee specifically wanted this year’s committee to revisit, and that they are essentially making that decision right now not to fund.

* + - * 1. **Janay Williams** asked if any of these one-year allocations were the result of one-year requests?

**Ellen Hermann** said that no, all of these came out of two-year requests. Some were intentional one-year allocations, like the Transfer and Veterans Resource Center rent. She does not believe that was the case for all of the requests.

**Karen Rowe** said that it is also because the committee lacks context.

**Ellen Hermann** said if you choose to not let units submit these requests, the committee will not get that context. Maybe the committee feels that’s okay and you do not have the funding and you do not want to waste the time on it.

* + - * 1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said another option that **Janay Williams** proposed was that instead telling units that they could submit requests for 2020-2021 in extreme circumstances, the committee could say that they will only consider requests for items that received one-year of funding for 2019-2020.

**Deb Geller** reminded the committee that in that case, it is still a million dollars. That would only leave the committee with $500K to recommend for 2021-2022

* + - * 1. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** asked if the committee “leaves door open,” how does that process work. Is it something like majority vote? For example, if a request comes in a part of the committee thinks that it is extraordinary and others do not, how does the committee move forward.

**Nicole Corona Diaz** said that usually, it is by majority vote. They might ask committee members to recommend high, low, and medium for each request. The lows are generally not funded. Mediums are items that will receive additional review if there is money left over (although there usually is not). High is something, when the majority of the committee members agree, that the committee will recommend funding for. There can still be discussion about how much is going to be funded (partially or fully funded).

**Deb Geller** said that last year, they went through this process, but they still ended up with $8-9 million in recommendations with only $5 million to allocate. Then, they had to cut high priority list items. For the second year, they did not even have $5 million to recommend, so more things were removed. All of the things that **Ellen Hermann** listed were still considered high priority, but in the context of limited resources, the committee could not justify funding. The committee gave so much between 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 and that is why this year, the committee is looking at so little left. There were arguments that the committee should have given less, but this is the situation that the committee is in today. There were things that were not funded that are high priority to students and are high value, but there just is not enough money for everything. It is a difficult place; the committee had to cut by 20% from 2019-2020 to 2020-2021 and the funding for 2019-2020 reflects about a 35% cut from the previous year. If the committee does not fund anything more for 2020-2021, we stick with that 20% reduction and then we fund approximately 45% in 2021-2022. If we fund more for 2020-2021, then we’re looking at a 50-60% cut to 2021-2022. There’s no good answer.

**Karen Rowe** said that if funding those items for 2020-2021 came to a $1 million-

**Ellen Hermann** said the amount is closer to $2 million.

**Karen Rowe** said if we went back to fund that amount, then the committee would only have $600K-$1 million available for the next year (2021-2022).

**Deb Geller** said it is so important to fund for two years out. If the committee considered allocating all of their funds to 2020-2021 to make up for the cuts, then on June 30th, 2021, all of these units would lose all their funding and would have no way to move forward on July 1. The Chancellor will not make decisions until August-September, so the units would move through the summer with no money and no way to continue to provide programs and services. It’s never in the best interest of student service-recipients to only fund for a single year; it risks programs having to shut down at the end of the year, waiting to hear the Chancellor’s decisions.

**Karen Rowe** said because the committee was forced into a corner, they had to make some of those one-time decisions. She added that they would have been in a deficit otherwise.

* + - 1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said the gravity of the situation can be understood based on the context that was provided.
         1. **Atreyi Mitra** said she likes using the suggestion from **Janay Williams** suggestion. That way, the exception still exists for units in desperate need of funding, but since the pool of funding is so small, the majority goes to 2021-2022.
         2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** suggested another straw poll. One option would be to move forward with **Janay Williams**’s suggestion and the other would be not accepting any submissions for 2020-2021 year. She recorded the votes; the majority of the committee wants to move forward with **Janay William’s** idea. The committee will consider requests for 2020-2021 only if the unit received a one-year allocation for 2019-2020.

**Karen Rowe** asked to clarify that the committee voted to open the door for requests from units that received one-time funding and that these requests could amount to $1 million dollars. She asked if the committee really wanted to invite units to do this and then deny them

**Deb Geller** suggested that the committee could say something like, “Although the committee intends to prioritize requests for the 2021-2022 year, in exceptional circumstances, we may consider funding for 2020-2021 those items that were funded only for 2019-2020.”

**Christine Wilson** recommended that committee members read documents in the Orientation materials to see where zeros occurred and what items were not funded last year. Some of those were decided in subcommittees, but some were decided last minute. That information could help people decide.

**Karen Rowe** said that sometimes those zeros were predicated on the fact that the carryforward was sufficient to and carried forward without funding them for an additional year. Sometimes it was also because the Student Affairs office withdrew requests for that following year.

* + - * 1. **Carina Salazar** asked last year, when recommendations were submitted to the Chancellor, if the entire committee in agreement with recommendations.

**Nicole Corona Diaz** said that everyone understood that they had to make a decision.

**Paulina Macias** said that committee members all compromised in the end because they understood that they had to get it done.

**Deb Geller** said that there were some areas that were cut that some members thought should have received more and there were some areas that received more that some members thought should have been cut. The total amount given was a compromise as well. The majority of the committee members recommended more money than was advised.

**Nicole Corona Diaz** said that they could probably say similar things about other years in SFAC as well.

* + - * 1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** suggested adding, “Although the committee will prioritize funding recommendations for 2021-2022, in exceptional circumstances we may consider recommending funding for 2020-2021 to those items that received one year funds for 2019-2020. ”

**Karen Rowe** asked if committee members from last year were permitted to bring in input from decisions from last year.

**Christine Wilson** said that yes, this is one of the benefits of having committee members serve for multiple years.

**Nicole Corona Diaz** removed the sentence “Therefore, the committee does not anticipate recommending additional funding allocations for 2020-2021.”

* 1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** read, “Campus entities are highly encouraged to reduce costs, while maintaining services, through cross-campus collaboration and by avoiding the duplication of student services.”
     1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** added that this is a suggestion, not a mandate.
  2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** read, “Units that received partial funding for programing in 2020-2021 may internally re-distribute the funds to meet the most pressing needs of any of the programs that were partially approved by the Chancellor.”
     1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that she included this piece on the basis that the committee was not revisiting any 2020-2021 funding requests. She thinks it is something worth considering. This might be difficult for APB.
     2. **Ellen Hermann** said that she loves the idea, but working it out (especially because the Chancellor has already approved things on a line-by-line basis) would be complicated. Moving forward it is a good idea.
     3. **Deb Geller** asked since the committee only makes recommendations and the Chancellor makes the decisions, does the committee have the authority to do this and does the committee have time to get this approved by the Chancellor before these documents need to be sent.
     4. **Ellen Hermann** said she believes that the Chancellor would need to approve this.
     5. **Christine Wilson** said that as she looked at spreadsheets, she saw positions that no longer have a reason to exist because the program that they worked with was not funded. In some cases it may be better to fully fund a portion of the items rather than partially fund all of the items. She said an example of receiving $60,000 of funding to hire students to do something. Because she did not receive funding for other things, she no longer needs that many students to work. However, in an environment in which people may see carryforward and assume I don’t need funds, I might use those funds and hire that many students. That is not a great use of funds. People may waste money because they say that they have to use money because SFAC gave it to them. Another example is that the committee gave the Graduate Student Resource Center $10K to hire a Program Coordinator for EID Day, but the committee did not give them the money to do that program. She said that **Ellen Hermann** gave a good point. One alternative that she thought of was that departments could propose an alternative way to move their funds around.
     6. **Deb Geller** said that if the committee was not already saying that units can request more money for the items that the committee has partially funded, then to say “if we partially funded and you would like to repurpose the amount that was recommended last year to fully fund some of the programs and unfund others, you can submit those requests,” the committee could have considered that philosophy, but if we’re saying (1) you can ask for the money we did not give you and (2) you can ask to repurpose, everyone will choose option 1. We’re going to get large amounts of additional requests. You could put into the recommendation letter anyway, something for those that have come back and requested that second year to say that we the Chancellor authorize you to redistribute the amount of money previously authorized based on your ability to deliver the services with limited funding. She does not think that the committee can commit to that today, but it is still something that they can do in next June.
     7. **Karen Rowe** said that the only problem is that- how many units will say something similar to the example that **Christine Wilson** provided with the $60K in funding for students-
     8. **Christine Wilson** said that the committee could be more fiscally conservative and could say, “okay, spend $30K on students and the other $30K into something else that you did not get funding for.”
     9. **Karen Rowe** said that as a committee, reviewing that type of proposal, we don’t have the skills to make fine determinations as to how much reinstituting a program might cost. It's a nightmare how we would propose those types of recommendations to the Chancellor.
     10. **Ellen Hermann** said that she does not think the idea is for the committee to suggest how units should reallocate funds, but instead to let the units decide how they would reallocate them. She added that she likes the idea of stating this in the letter at the end of the year.
     11. **Deb Geller** said that this was intended to say “do as you believe is best.”
         1. **Ellen Hermann** added that this would, of course, have to be within the SSF guidelines.
     12. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that they can include this in the letter at the end of the year.
  3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** reviewed, “As accustomed in previous years, SFAC has discussed and agreed to consider areas of interest for SSF funds. The following list will be consulted during SFAC’s deliberation: Programs and services previously funded by SSF funds that have been proven successful and provide direct benefit to students; Programs and services that address challenges experienced by students from low-income and non-traditional backgrounds; Innovative programs that enhance students’ leadership and professional development for career aspirations; Cross-campus collaborative efforts that maximize efficient usage of funding, minimize duplicative services, and include cost-saving measures; Preventative efforts and or other holistic areas of student wellness that reduce influx to clinical mental health services.”
     1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee members if they want to accept last year’s committee’s "areas of interest” or if they want to change them.
     2. **Atreyi Mitra** said that the committee could add “underserved” in second item before “low-income.”
     3. **Janay Williams** asked what an example of what “successful” means in first item. She said that she's unsure if just because something is “successful” it should be a priority. For example, there is the example of Athletics, which may be considered very “successful,” but the committee has cut funding from them.
        1. **Deb Geller** suggested using the word “effective” instead of “successful.” She added that they could change that point to reflect “currently funded” instead of previously and they could add language to indicate that there is data or evidence that this service provides a direct benefit to students.
        2. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** asked about why they would use “currently funded” in this point and if that is necessary.
        3. **Deb Geller** said that if a unit is requesting funding for something that is a currently funded position, the unit needs to be able to demonstrate (a) provides a benefit to students and (b) is effective. All of the other parts encompass the new requests. It puts the expectation out there that just because you have money today, does not mean that you will automatically continue to receive funding without proving that you are effective to students. Most requests that come in year after year ask for funds based on the fact that they have received funding in the past, not based on evidence of effectiveness.
     4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** changed first bullet to “Programs and services currently funded by SSF funds that data prove to have been effective by providing direct services to students.”
     5. **Carina Salazar** asked student representatives to provide perspective based on their experiences. She wanted to know about areas of need that they thought were important
        1. **Atreyi Mitra** suggested funds and services that students are currently advocating for. That would reflect what students think is needed. What other students want should inform what we are discussing.
        2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked **Atreyi Mitra** if adding “programs and services that are currently being advocated for by students” encompasses what she was envisioning.
        3. **Atreyi Mitra** said that she believes her job as a student committee member is to amplify the voices of other students and convey their priorities. She said that she is unsure if that is something to be included here.
        4. **Karen Rowe** asked if most of these things are things that students needed. For example, she asked if they needed advocacy for underserved student populations or students from non-traditional backgrounds.
           1. **Atreyi Mitra** said yes, this is important to students.
        5. **Karen Rowe** asked about preventative mental health services because that was added last year as a response to student committee members’ concerns for expanding models of wellness care.
        6. **Atreyi Mitra** asked about the last point (referring to preventative efforts in mental health). She asked if it is it better to continue to fund programs that we know work or is it better to fund new ideas.
        7. **Ellen Hermann** said that she felt that the previous SFAC committee really preferred not continuing to fund the same things. However, she has pushed the committee to explicitly say what they would prefer to fund and she has not seen any descriptions of what that would be.
        8. **Deb Geller** said that last year, there was a lot of frustration with a dollar amount that was given by the state and came down through the Office of the President for mental health that before it was given to the campus was predetermined that it would all be given to Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS). The committee broadly would have preferred, if it had the authority to do so, to strip some of that funding away to go to some different things, like CARE, that they considered to be mental health-related, but not clinical.
        9. **Ellen Hermann** said that she did not believe that the committee ever explicitly name CARE in the letter to the Chancellor and those are the sorts of things that would be helpful for the Chancellor to see. If that is how the committee feels, she recommended that they put that in the letter.
        10. **Karen Rowe** said that although it did not make it in to the letter, she said it multiple times. She also said that they needed to search for a different model of preventative care.
        11. **Ellen Hermann** said that even the year prior to last, there were similar conversations happening. She recommended that the committee is as explicit as possible in the letter so that they can document this in the letter to the Chancellor.
        12. **Karen Rowe** said that she advocated for this several times and went down a list of units that she thought should be included with last year’s committee.
        13. **Denise Marshall** said that although this list existed, last year’s committee could not agree on which units should be included as well as what type of additional information (if any) about funding for those units should be included.
  4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked committee to thoroughly review documents before next week’s meeting.

1. **Approval and Discussion of Student Service Fee Funding Questions**
   1. **N/A**
2. **Discussion of Master Student Amendment to Charter**
   1. **N/A**
3. **Announcements**
   1. **N/A**
4. **Adjournment**
   1. **Denise Marshall** moved to adjourn the meeting, **Karen Rowe** seconded**.** With no objections, **Nicole Corona Diaz** adjourned the meeting at 6:33pm.