**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

**2325 Murphy Hall**

 **5:00-7:00 PM**

**Tuesday, November 13, 2018**

**Present:**

Graduates: Jazz Kiang, Denise Marshall, Javier Rodriguez

Graduate Nominee: Zak Fisher

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

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

APB Advisor: Ellen Hermann (Ex-Officio)

Faculty Rep: Karen Rowe, Professor

SFAC Advisor: Marilyn Alkin (Ex-Officio)

**Absent**:

Mike Cohn, Director of SOLE

Barbara Wilson, UCLA Housing & Hospitality

1. **Call to order**
	1. **Jazz Kiang** called the meeting to order at 5:05pm.
2. **Approval of Agenda**
	1. **Jazz Kiang** requested to amend the agenda as the minutes from November 6th, 2018 were not available for the committee to review.
	2. **Christina Wang** moved to approve the agenda as amended. **Karen Rowe** seconded. With no objections, the agenda was approved as amended by consent.
3. **Review of Handouts**
4. **Review and Approve Minutes**
5. **APB, temporary and Permanent discussion**
	1. **Jazz Kiang** stated that it was necessary for the committee toreview the concepts of temporary and permanent SSF funds. **Ellen Hermann** lead the review.
	2. **Ellen Hermann** reviewed the UCLA SFAC 2018-2019 Orientation slides to go over Student Servies Fee Revenue Distribution. **Ellen Hermann** stated that it would be helpful to review how student services fees are collected and get distributed. **Ellen Hermann** stated that the account SFAC makes recommendations from is the unallocated SSF account, sometimes referred to as the SFAC account. **Ellen Hermann** stated that anything that is not designated as perm is temporary money that goes to the unallocated account. **Ellen Hermann** stated that APB designates the amount of permanent funds going to the unallocated account. **Ellen Hermann** stated APB tries to keep the total perm around 95%-97% of total revenue and leaves cushion if some of it is not truly reoccurring. **Karen Rowe** asked where does the off the top coming in for CAPS come from and if it was all permanent? **Ellen Hermann** stated that it is generally permanent, but this year it will not be permanent because it is one-time funding. **Karen Rowe** asked if that is in addition to the net SSF funding? **Ellen Hermann** stated that in this chart, it would be coming out of the next SSF funding, based on how net SSF funding was defined. **Ellen Hermann** stated that if the Chancellor approves the distribution of SSF funds, if they are receiving Chancellor funding it will not be on SSF funds, typically, and is not captured on the diagram. **Ellen Hermann** stated what is left goes into the unallocated account, that SFAC makes recommendation out of, and is generally distributed as temp funding to the departments. **Ellen Herrmann** stated that any one-year funding is not permanent funding. APB tries to keep most, but not 100%, of the reoccurring revenue as permanent and clarified that recurring revenue makes it perm.
	3. **Javier Rodriguez** asked if there has been a request for APB to review departments that have not been fulfilling their mission when using SSF funds? **Ellen Hermann** stated that APB has been requested to do that but it is up to SFAC to review if a unit does not need permanent funding and to make that recommendation to the Chancellor. **Karen Rowe** asked what happens if someone holds a permanent position, leaves or retires, is there any option to suggest that it should revert to SFAC permanent funds? **Ellen Hermann** stated that it currently stays with the unit as generally units refill the positions. **Ellen Hermann** stated that APB does not have an easy way of keeping track of whether these positions are filled at any given point, and typically positions may be filled with a new hire or the unit will reallocate those funds. **Ellen Hermann** stated that there is value in units having flexibility with their funds; and allowing units to utilize their funds as needed to provide student services. **Karen Rowe** asked if it is correct that on average a certain amount is being allocated for benefits and if there are no changes in students fees is there a decreasing amount of unallocated temporary funding for programs? **Ellen Hermann** stated yes, assuming there are no increases in the SSF level, the amount of the benefits shortfall could go up but it has also been substantially lower in years past and has varied significantly over the years. **Ellen Hermann** stated that off the top of her head she did not know, but a reasonable explanation would be when they have salary savings they can allocate towards benefits and have less of a short fall. **Javier Rodriguez** asked why did the numbers (for SFAC recommended funding in the forecast) jump from $4 million to $2 million so drastically and **Ellen Hermann** stated the excel sheet had arbitrary numbers. **Ellen Hermann** stated the budget is decreasing if the committee assumes no increase in SSF. **Ellen Hermann** stated that she advises the committee to not spend all of their available funding or more than what has been allocated for this year.
	4. **Jazz Kiang** stated that the Regents are meeting next week and a rumor is that an agenda item discussing a tuition and fee increase has been removed. **Jazz Kiang** stated that starting at the end of this month, November, and into December the UC will start its formal budget negotiations with the state. **Jazz Kiang** stated that the Regents seem to be looking towards not having an increase and getting the state to buyout the equivalent of an increase, for political reasons. **Jazz Kiang** shared with the committee that none of what is decided is decided in a vacuum. **Deb Geller** state that the SFAC over the past two years allocated almost $7 million for 2018-2019, without the resources to continue those programs next year there will have to be tough decisions and in effect programs will have to be cut as a result of what this group prioritizes. **Deb Geller** stated to give $7 million when there is only $8 million would be irresponsible. **Deb Geller** stated that SFAC has to assume that not everything that is currently being funded can be funded next year and SFAC will have to look at what can carry-forward help support and what just can’t continue. **Zak Fisher** stated that he believes that is a premature determination and does not believe that UCLA will be in that position. **Ellen Hermann** stated that the benefits merit funding comes in a two-year cycle, typically, and the committee should expect to receive another request. **Ellen Hermann** stated that theoretically if the committee did not decide to provide funding it would be a cut to the units as units depend on benefits and merits to help support their staff but if they provide this funding it will also lower the committees permanent budget. **Ellen Hermann** stated that these are merit adjustments and not a cost of living increase, but works out to be about the same as inflation.
	5. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked if the previous committee can discuss the impact on making the one-year temporary allocations rather than the requested two-year allocations. **Neemat Abdusemed** stated that the committee spent almost one meeting to discuss whether a one-year temporary allocation was the right decision. **Neemat Abdusemed** stated the committee assessed the situation and realized how much SSF SFAC would receive and battling between the right things to do as many students & members of the committee utilize the resources. **Neemat Abdusemed** stated that the committee recognized the importance of various services and evaluated how the committee be fiscally responsible to ensure that programs that need to survive the years after can. **Deb Geller** stated that from the departmental perspective it's not that its two years versus one year, it’s timing. **Deb Geller** stated that what Jazz Kiang recommended in moving up the request cycle is critical, but is only effective if the Chancellor and his advisors believe there is enough information for them to make their decision prior to the end of spring. **Deb Geller** stated typically the request goes to the Chancellor in spring and final decisions are not allocated until sometime in summer. With one-year funding the funding ends on June 30th and programs, if the Chancellor has not announced decisions, cannot continue on July 1st if carry forward designated for that purpose as a reserve is not available. **Deb Geller** stated if the Chancellor responds to SFAC moving early, announces decisions early, and commits on-going to that, a one year is less negatively impactful. **Deb Geller** stated it is a timing issue more than a continuity issue to plan to shut things down or find a way to keep things going. **Karen Rowe** stated that all subcommittees had accepted proposals for a two-year cycle of funding but the budget was still uncertain. **Karen Rowe** stated the committee had to review each decision for every department and decide what could be cut without cutting a fundamental mission. **Ellen Hermann** stated that APB tries to be fiscally prudent and to make assumptions with the most current information. **Karen Rowe** stated that the committee also took into account that if they over allocated it would be hard, and shared that attrition is one thing and cold turkey is another.
	6. **Karen Rowe** requested for Ellen Hermann to expand on the historical pattern of the SSF levels, considering that there had been a commitment to 5 years of increase funding. **Ellen Hermann** stated that the SSF level had varied and there had been a commitment to continue to increase by 5%, but had not happened. **Ellen Hermann** advises the committee to not create a deficit as it would be a deficit on the books and filled in from future revenue. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked where would the money come from? **Ellen Hermann** stated in those years nowhere and eventually people would be given permission to spend based on the commitments but there will not be any money backing it and will be a deficit until future revenue comes in. **Jazz Kiang** tried clarifying Nicole Corona Diaz’s question and asked if there is a debt how does the campus determine how the debt will be repaid? **Ellen Hermann** stated generally future revenue will go towards it as it comes in. **Ellen Hermann** stated that the bottom-line is that the committee would not want to get into a deficit. **Jazz Kiang** stated that the committee will have to decide how to approach the budget deliberations and when the committee gets to that point the committee established how to approach that. **Karen Rowe** stated that when departments are presenting to SFAC, SFAC will need to push on questions of priorities.  **Karen Rowe** stated that she does not want SFAC to be in the position that will be better made at department, division, or unit levels when they can give guidance for what is essential and how they can adjust downward. **Zak Fisher** stated that it feels like a tough reality and that the reality is that we are living in an oligarchic situation and folks with power and folks that are hoarding wealth are having an extreme unprecedented situation where administrative salaries are out of control and SFAC will have to deny student services. **Neemat Abdusemed** asked **Zak Fisher** what solution or what could the committee due to address the issue that has been brought up? **Zak Fisher** stated realistically the committee will need to find a solution that can pass by the number of folks on the committee even when there are different interests than student interest. However, that that is where students come to the bargaining table at the state of affairs. **Zak Fisher** stated that if the committee wanted to send a budget with a deficit and include a message stating this could and should be covered from other sources particularly gross over payments to administrators in the hoarding of wealth previously discussed. Zak Fisher stated that initial numbers and the look down the road to cap administrators pay to the governors salary and the principal that students are coming from is that the committee has a responsibility and an obligation to question the incredible ballooned administrative salaries. **Zak Fisher** thinks that that is a realistic solution ad discusses priorities, fiscal responsibilities, and harsh realties and in principle graduate students are on board with that as that is the community he is here to speak for.
6. **Carry forward SSF funds discussion**
	1. **Jazz Kiang** stated that he would like to know SFAC’s stance on the appropriate use of units SSF carry forward funds. **Ellen Hermann** stated that this is what departments have left over at the end of the year that gets carried over into the next year. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked if during the unit review if units did not have a good reason of why they had carry forward how did the committee respond when making recommendations. **Jazz Kiang** stated that previously the committee did not receive the full picture regarding carry forward. Also, it was all the spur of the moment when directors presented, many unit directors could not answer the question completely in person, the documents last year led to misinterpretation for what was considered as SSF, and some information provided may not have been accurate. **Deb Geller** stated she hopes units that receive funding from SFAC with carry forward, will acknowledge their carry forward and inform the committee that they have been funding a particular program and state they will not use funding for 19/20 and instead will use carry forward to continue the program/s that SFAC has been supporting. **Jazz Kiang** stated he would like SFAC to encourage units to strategically use their funds. **Jazz Kiang** stated he does not want to get into a situation where SFAC is telling units to spend all their funds to have zero carry forward because that might turn into inefficient spending. **Jazz Kiang** stated he also doesn’t want units requesting the full amount of something while having carry forward funds and would prefer units to use their carry forward funds for other things that the committee did not recommend. **Zak Fisher** stated that he would hope that the budgets requested are what people need. **Javier Rodriguez** asked what would be the outcome if SFAC was to not recommend for merits and have departments finance it, so if they have carry forward they have to carry it themselves? Carry forward has been a conversation SFAC has had for years and SFAC has never had a resolution made for it. **Jazz Kiang** stated that a guideline has not been sent to leadership to share SFAC committees' concerns. **Jazz Kiang** stated an idea to consider is drafting a message that outlines what carryforward SSF funds should be going towards and that it should be used in accordance to the scope of work for what they were approved to be used for. **Ellen Hermann** stated that her recommendation would be to use funds in accordance with SSF policy but would recommend giving units a little more leeway than only allowing funds to be used as specifically requested, as units need flexibility. **Ellen Hermann** stated to look at trends in carry forward more rather than carry forward in a given year. **Deb Geller** would like the ask to quantify that they are not asking for 100% of the costs as some positions are designated for work study. **Jazz Kiang** stated he would put together a draft of something that could be sent to the campus administrative leadership after receiving input from the committee. **Jazz Kiang** also stated he will input information regarding work study positions.
	2. **Jazz Kiang** asked if the committee should recommend a process for funding shifts if there is a significant amount of carry forward. **Ellen Hermann** stated that Jazz Kiang’s suggestion could be a lot of work to monitor, and added discussions for the committee, and having units report on that would create a lot of work for a lot of people that could be done in a more general way. **Zak Fisher** stated that if units keep their carry forward funds they have the burden of explaining why and how they’re going to use it as it is not on SFAC to complete that process for them. **Neemat Abudsemed** stated that this was an issue last year and her suggestion is to send out a note that SFAC is expecting units to use their carry forward for what it was allocated for. If this expectation is not met SFAC should place stipulations on particular allocations that were used for something else. **Ellen Hermann** stated that is similar to what APB does in their central office and could be a way to approach this in the future when seeing increasing amounts of carry forward. **Deb Geller** stated that carry forward needs to be one of a number of factors considered after receiving review and requests. That is to see how they are justified in what they are doing as not all carry forward is used for specific things and can sometimes be saving for a larger project looming. Carry forward is not always out of not doing what SFAC has authorized for them to do. **Deb Geller** stated SFAC certainly has to review the responses and if it doesn't seem credible or valid it seems entirely reasonable for the committee to use that as a factor for the requests coming the following year.
7. **Winter meeting time**
	1. **Jazz Kiang** asked the SFAC committee to fill out the doodle poll to begin scheduling a potential winter time. Jazz Kiang stated that this will be revisited at next week’s meeting.
8. **Ad hoc subcommittees**
9. **Announcements**
	1. **Marilyn Alkin** stated that the students should not fill out a timesheet as previously instructed.
10. **Adjournment**
	1. **Neemat Abdusemed** moves & **Javier Rodriguez** seconded at 6:45pm. With no objections, the meeting was adjourned by consent.