**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

 **1215 Murphy Hall**

**Friday, May 25, 2018 from 2:00- 5:00pm**

**Present:**

Graduates: Jazz Kiang, Nicole Ngaosi, Javier Rodríguez & Cody Trojan

Undergraduates: Neemat Abdusemed, Richard White (Chair), Christina Wang

Administration: Mike Cohn, Director of SOLE

Paolo Velasco, Director of Bruin Resource Center

Barbara Wilson, Director of Room Divisions in HHS

Faculty Rep: Karen Rowe, Professor

APB Advisor: Ellen Hermann (Ex-Officio)

SFAC Advisor: Marilyn Alkin, SFAC Advisor

**Absent**: Katie Kim, Undergrad Rep

1. **Call to Order:**
	1. The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m.

1. **Review of handouts**

1. **Approval of Agenda**
	1. ***Cody Trojan*** moved and was seconded by ***Paolo Velasco*** to move the budget discussion after the minutes approval. There were 7 votes to approve and passed unanimously.
	2. A motion was made by ***Jazz Kiang*** and seconded by ***Nicole Ngaosi*** to approve the agenda. The motion passed unanimously to approve agenda.

1. **Review and Approve Minutes**
2. A motion was made by ***Cody Trojan*** and seconded by ***Neemat Abdusemed*** to table the minutes pending SFAC receiving new edit updates. There were 8 votes to table 5/11/18 minutes.The motion passed unanimously to approve minutes.
3. A motion was made by ***Jazz Kiang*** and seconded by ***Nicole Ngaosi*** to table the 5/18/18 minutes pending SFAC receiving new edit updates. The motion passed unanimously to approve minutes.
4. **APB Budget Forecast Scenarios**
5. ***Ellen Hermann*** stated that both scenarios in the forecast assume flat enrollment when in actuality there will likely be some enrollment growth in the range of 350-400 students, suggesting the 0% scenario is likely slightly understated.
6. ***Karen Rowe*** asked whether the State’s enrollment mandate would be affect the model and whether the model takes into account enrollment growth funding. ***Paolo Velasco*** stated that the yield is higher than anticipated which resulted in adding an additional freshmen orientation and a higher yield for transfers as well. ***Ellen Hermann*** stated the there is no enrollment growth funding from the State, which wouldn’t affect the model anyway, since it wouldn’t come in the form of SSF funds.
7. ***Ellen Hermann*** explained the two scenarios/models presented in which the 0% model is likely understated and the 5% model is likely overstated. Assuming SSF fees fund what SFAC has recommended, there will be a deficit in the 0% scenario and a surplus in the 5% scenario.
8. Both models forecast that future SFACs spendings will be limited.
	* 1. ***Cody Trojan*** stated he felt comfortable working in the 0% model and interpreted that if SFAC did not spend further money and maintained the 7 million recommended funding, there would still be a 1.6 million deficit. He had a concern about expanding services without money.
		2. ***Ellen Hermann*** reiterated that in the past there have been increases in the Student Services Fee but it's difficult to know if there will be in the future. The models assume no increase in enrollment but may change, which would also increase the 0% scenario.
		3. ***Karen Rowe*** stated that a number of mandates from UCOP including basic needs and mental health were going to be disperse funding directly to campuses.
			1. ***Ellen Hermann*** was unsure about the specific programs but believes there will be some funding dispersed but was uncertain to which programs.
			2. ***Nicole Ngaosi*** stated that SFAC shouldn't make assumptions on the dedicated allocations to campuses which have been lower than it has been in the past. ***Karen Rowe*** stated that it was surviving the UC Regents and legislature. ***Paolo Velasco*** asked if next year's committee will have a better sense of whether there will be an increase. ***Ellen Hermann*** stated it she was unsure. ***Paolo Velasco*** suggested that spending a little over $5million over the next year, then they can cut the number down knowing the next year's committee can see the requests the following year if they have increased funding. He shared an example that if a position will not be funded in future years, it takes about a year to coach and prepare the staff member to transition.
			3. ***Cody Trojan*** does not know why the forecasts shows next year's committee spending $3million the next years when last year’s SFAC recommended funding more than that. ***Ellen Hermann*** stated that last year's committee gave out a lot because they had a large ending balance were advised to allocate more because of an agreement that the SSF fee would increase 5% each year over the next few years. Had APB known that there might not be an increase, they would have cautioned SFAC.
			4. ***Jazz Kiang*** stated that the increase of tuition and fees was not discussed at the May Regents’ Meeting as it was supposed to be. The Regents have potentially left it on the table for the July meeting.
		4. ***Richard White*** recommended keeping 2019/20 the same levels because it will still be close to $5million. ***Neemat Abdusemed*** agreed with ***Paolo Velasco*** about funding for this year and reduce the 2019/20. ***Paolo Velasco*** asked ***Richard White*** based on their timeline what could the committee achieve in the remaining meetings. ***Richard White*** shared there were only 2 meetings left, he suggested that the committee could consider prioritizing 2018/19 and not recommending for 2019/20 altogether. ***Jazz Kiang*** agreed with considering the suggestion, but noted that it is more radical. ***Cody Trojan*** stated they could pick a number and have a group pick which requests are funded. ***Neemat Abdusemed*** stated they could look at the staff positions. ***Paolo Velasco*** asked how much of the $5 million were requests to fund staff.
		5. ***Ellen Hermann*** stated it was difficult to calculate because submissions were labeled differently but estimated that the recommended funding for new and continuing staffing requests for 18/19 was $864,437 and 19/20 was $3.1million.
			1. ***Paolo Velasco*** stated if SFAC prioritizes staffing for 19/20 SFAC can staff positions across the board knowing they should come back to request again. ***Paolo Velasco*** reiterated it's better knowing one year ahead to help them transition. ***Karen Rowe*** stated if they wanted to cut the amount of funding for staff, SFAC should review 2018/19 new staff positions and freeze those positions.
			2. ***Jazz Kiang*** recommended the potential of zeroing 19/20 and then reviewing temporary and permanent requests to put them on the same cycle rather than different cycles. ***Cody Trojan*** thought the 19/20 was so much lower because last year's committee provided so much funding. ***Karen Rowe*** stated last year's committee approved 17/18 and 18/19. She stated the $700,000 was the new approval, not the year's prior. ***Karen Rowe*** agreed with ***Cody Trojan***'s recommendation from a few weeks ago in terms of new requests for staffing for 18/19. ***Cody Trojan*** clarified his recommendation was to have no growth.
		6. ***Cody Trojan*** stated that if SFAC recommends no growth or zero, he doesn't think it will solve much but will be between $100,000-200,000 for both 18/19 and 19/20.
		7. ***Paolo Velasco*** made a strong recommendation that next year’s committee do a call for requests as soon as possible.
		8. ***Nicole Ngaosi*** stated the importance of new temp requests and setting priorities because there were some promising new proposals that could provide stability for some departments. She felt it's a disservice to proposals that were cut from state funding.
		9. ***Jazz Kiang*** stated that maybe new requests may be more important than the continuing requests. The paradigm SFAC had operated currently was giving priority to continuing requests but if emerging needs arise, new temporary requests may take priority. ***Cody Trojan*** stated that SFAC can add a question to the call letter for departments to rank their requests. ***Jazz Kiang*** stated zeroing out 19/20 provides this option. He then suggested that subcommittees review all 18/19 requests and provide a revised increased 18/19 with a better understanding of priorities. ***Karen Rowe*** stated that even though staffing is an important part of most of the requests submitted, it doesn't mean they shouldn't ask what are some of the big programmatic asks from this year. For example, the tough one was the centralized computing from OTC. ***Jazz Kiang*** agreed this was what he was proposing and recommended breaking out into subcommittees and reconvening in 20-minutes to review 18/19 funding decisions. ***Neemat Abdusemed*** clarified that if SFAC zeros out 19/20, are they reviewing those to reduce or completely zero out. She was not comfortable with zeroing because she thinks they should review the programs and staffing as well. ***Cody Trojan*** did not understand how the logic to zero out 19/20 would help future SFACs if they are also planning to look more favorably to increasing funding for 18/19. ***Paolo Velasco*** stated that it may be a new request but an existing position/program. He sees the value of reviewing proposals with history and if it was valuable. ***Cody Trojan*** stated that some of those programs may have other funding sources that SFAC would be relieving for departments.
		10. ***Cody Trojan*** summarized that the recommendation was the zero out 19/20 and then assign a number or maintain what is recommended. The problem with reduction, it requires more review and judgment and there is no criteria except the priorities from the call letter which ***Richard White*** stated was not being considered. ***Karen Rowe*** stated she doesn't remember approving a lot of new staffing that were already being temporarily funded. ***Cody Trojan*** recommended reviewing what they haven't reviewed or pick a number to reduce by and have the subcommittees to make judgments whether to reduce or just zero out 19/20. ***Richard White*** reiterated that the letter needed to be sent out week 10.
			1. ***Paolo Velasco*** asked students if they have time to meet with their subcommittee. ***Nicole Ngaosi*** moved and seconded by ***Neemat Abdusemed*** to have SFAC break into subcommittees for 20-30minutes to revisit continuing temp and new request from 18/19. There were 11 votes to approve and the motion passed.

**ENTER Executive Session**- A motion was made by ***Karen Rowe*** and seconded by ***Christina Wang*** to move into Executive Session and the motion passed with 9 votes to approve and 2 abstentions.

1. **Review of 18/19 Funding requests**

**EXIT Executive Session-** ***Karen Rowe*** moved and was seconded by ***Cody Trojan*** to exit executive session. The motion passed unanimously.

1. **Charter Subcommittee**
2. ***Cody Trojan*** and ***Karen Rowe*** presented on the Charter which was discussed by the subcommittee via email. They felt there were no need for amendments and advised no changes to the Charter.
3. ***Richard White*** stated that there was a need to change the word “stipends” to “compensation.” A previous SFAC committee had voted to change from stipends to compensation so it does not affect their financial aid. ***Karen Rowe*** moved and was seconded by ***Javier Rodríguez*** to change the words “stipends” to “compensation.”
4. **By Laws Subcommittees**
5. ***Neemat Abdusemed*** stated that there were no changes although ***Christina Wang*** had a question about the recusal process. ***Richard White*** stated that last year's SFAC chair and committee voted 9 in favor of and 3 against having not only directors but also students who work in departments recuse themselves during the initial review and discussion of funding requests. ***Cody Trojan*** clarified that this rule was not in the bylaws. ***Neemat Abdusemed*** stated there were lots of debates. ***Nicole Ngaosi*** stated it was a complex conversation and multiple iterations in which the group couldn’t agree. ***Richard White*** had spoken to the Vice Chancellor of the Student Affairs about this issue and he was also in agreement with Richard White that students should not leave the room. ***Paolo Velasco*** clarified that in past SFACs students had left the room and there were legitimate rationale on both sides but part of it was that there was an existing protocol that previous SFAC members had complied by. Last year, members asked if this was a student majority committee, how they could make a decision if they are not in the initial conversations. ***Paolo Velasco*** asked that if SFAC makes a decision on something, what do future SFAC have to do if they disagree with the decision. On a larger issue, the committee should set a precedent. He felt future SFACs should comply with the decision. There was a vote last year regarding this decision and the recommended change went to the Chancellor. The Chancellor heard it was a rushed decision which is why he asked this year’s committee for an investigation and to make a decision to recommend. ***Karen Rowe*** disagreed it was not a rushed decision. ***Nicole Ngaosi*** would argue with ***Karen Rowe’s*** statement.
6. ***Cody Trojan*** shared that SFAC’s charter stated that all changes that are proposed needed to be circulated to the committee for review at least 7 days prior to a vote. ***Jazz Kiang*** stated that if they want to vote next week, they need the draft of the changes sent out tonight.
7. ***Javier Rodríguez*** asked if they can also discuss including transfer students in the committee.
8. **Announcements**
	1. ***Richard White*** asked SFAC to review the letter to the Chancellor and to make a note to indicate members had read the letter. ***Richard White*** also requested that the low recommendations include explanations about why subcommittees are not recommending funding. The UCOP Tax letter will be submitted with the letter to the Chancellor.
9. **Adjournment**
10. A motion was made by ***Jazz Kiang*** and seconded by ***Mike Cohn*** to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 5:08pm.