**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

**1215 Murphy Hall**

**Friday, March 2, 2018 from 3:00- 5:00pm**

**Present:**

Graduates: Jazz Kiang (Vice Chair), Nicole Ngaosi & Cody Trojan

Undergraduates: Neemat Abdusemed & Christina Wang

Administration: Mike Cohn, Director of SOLE

Paolo Velasco, Director of Bruin Resource Center

Barbara Wilson, Director of Room Divisions in HHS

Faculty: Karen Rowe, Professor

SFAC Advisor: Marilyn Alkin

APB Advisor Ellen Hermann

**Absent**: Richard White (Chair), Javier Rodríguez & Katie Kim,

Guest(s): AVC Jeff Roth, Rebecca Lee-Garcia & IVC Monroe Gorden

* **Call to Order:**
  1. ***Jazz Kiang*** called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.
* **Approval of Agenda**

A motion was made by ***Christina Wang*** and seconded by ***Paolo Velasco*** on approved agenda. The vote passed unanimously.

* **Review and Approve Minutes**
  1. A motion was made by ***Karen Rowe*** and second by ***Paolo Velasco*** to table minutes for 2/16/18 and to be approved next meeting. The vote passed unanimously.
* **Student Affairs and APB Budget Discussion** 
  1. ***Jazz Kiang*** opened meeting for discussion with Academic Planning and Budget (APB), with AVC Jeff Roth and Rebecca Lee-Garcia and Students Affairs- Interim Vice Chancellor, Monroe Gorden to discuss permanent budget, UCOP tax, and to answer questions from the committee.
  2. AVC Jeff Roth spoke about overviews for next year’s budget. At this time, APB does not have that much information to provide for next year’s budget. He was hoping that the Regents would have made more decision by now. Regents decided not to vote and wanted to wait until the state budget process fully played out, before making a decision about next year fee levels for students, which includes the tuition rate and the student services fee. The problem with waiting for the state budget process is that it plays out in June, which is too late when planning for next year’s budget. This also affects the campus planning budget process.
  3. Rebecca Lee-Garcia provided different scenarios on chart (see handout).
     1. Assumes 0% increase in student services fees through 2020-21 - Assumes total allocation of $4.5M over three years (combination of temp and perm, 2017-18 SFAC recommendation)
        1. Scenario 1: 18/19 Perm Allocation to Campus: $0M

Temporary Allocation to Campus: $2.5M; $2M

* + - 1. Scenario 2: 18/19 Perm Allocation to Campus: $0.25M

Temporary Allocation to Campus: $2M; $1.75M

* + - 1. Scenario 3: 18/19 Perm Allocation to Campus: $0.5M

Temporary Allocation to Campus: $1.5M; $1.5M

* + - * 1. ***Nicole*** ***Ngaosi*** asked what would be a good dollar amount from the perm budget to be considered stable. Rebecca Lee-Garcia explained that if the perm budget were left untouched, it would be considered stable.
        2. ***Christina Wang*** asked about the student fees that come in every year and if it is factored into the budget on chart. Rebecca Lee-Garcia stated that every student pays a fee and those fees go into a “revenue bucket,” where all perm budgets are to be paid from.
        3. ***Karen Rowe*** asked what determines why certain monies coming in are deemed permanent and ongoing as opposed to coming in for temporary allocations. Rebecca Lee-Garcia referred to increases on chart and existing permanent budget.
    1. Assumes 5% increase in student services fees through 2020-21 - Assumes total allocation of $7.5M over three years (combination of temp and perm, 2017-18 SFAC recommendation)
       1. Scenario 1: 18/19 Perm Allocation to Campus: $0M

Temporary Allocation to Campus: $3.5M; $4M

* + - 1. Scenario 2: 18/19 Perm Allocation to Campus: $0.75M

Temporary Allocation to Campus: $2.25M; $3M

* + - 1. Scenario 3: 18/19 Perm Allocation to Campus: $1M

Temporary Allocation to Campus: $2M; $2.5M

* + - * 1. AVC Jeff Roth stated that the need for services on campus are high. Currently the demands are not being met and does not seem like this will change in the near term. However, it does strengthens the case, in which they continue to get the 5% adjustments, when they get a 5% increase, there is more funding for services so that the campus can meet the student demand for services.
        2. IVC Monroe Gorden stated that one of the reasons why the increase to the student services fee happened in the first place was because there was a great stagnation between student services fee and tuition fee over the year. Even the 5% increase was an attempt to try and get closer, however,

still far off between the kinds of increases received throughout the years from tuitions vs. student services fees received. Regents and UCOP are well aware of this. He agrees with scenarios presented by Rebecca Lee-Garcia and AVC Jeff Roth.

* + - * 1. ***Barbara Wilson*** asked how long it has been without an increase in student services fees. IVC Monroe Gorden stated that in the past 12 years, SFAC has not provided any permanent funding. In addition to stagnation, there were also significant cuts that put units further behind.
        2. ***Jazz Kiang*** stated to avoid confusion, it is important to show case all SSF movements every year and not just unallocated account (referring to chart organization). IVC Monroe Gorden stated new monies are not coming in on previously allocated student services fee amounts, unless it comes through the student services fee committee.
        3. ***Karen Rowe*** stated that one component is that some units are funded from other sources and not just from SFAC funds. IVC Monroe Gorden stated that this is information that units can provide during unit reviews.
        4. ***Karen Rowe*** stated that the problem SFAC faces when making recommendations for permanent positions, is that it is immediately effective. Most of the allocations being reviewed currently are temporary approvals for allocations for 2019/20 because units have been funded on a 2-year cycles. IVC Monroe Gorden stated that it might be an option to not fund permanent positions this year and reconsider next year, after getting a better sense on the budget picture. He encourages the committee to think of different ways on how to look at allocations. Possibly move back from the larger picture on funding and permanent funding distribution going into next year.
* **Budget Discussion: Temp to Perm and OP Tax**
  1. ***Jazz Kiang*** opened the floor for questions:
     1. ***Cody Trojan*** stated that UCOP is not providing a student service and are primarily funded by general funds. IVC Monroe Gorden stated that UCOP is funded across all funding sources and does not agree that it is only tuition or one particular source of funding. This tax becomes an appropriate use because it is levied against student service units. Student services fees are primarily for student service units and becomes an expenditure from a student service unit. One of the rules that did change, there was a recasting of the student services fee policy, which provided greater flexibility and less restrictions on student services fees. OP tax is based on the expenditures that come out of the various units.
     2. ***Paolo Velasco*** stated if the committee made a recommendation to the Chancellor to not pay a UCOP tax, or if the department could not pay the tax, the university would then have to find another source of funding. AVC Jeff Roth stated if that were to be the case, then quite possibly, that organization would have to make cuts, cut their budgets, or reduce their expenditures.
     3. ***Neemat Abdusemed*** asked (for clarification), once the UCOP tax is charged, it will go from the campus to the Chancellor and then to spread to the units. The units would then be responsible for paying the tax. If found that the fees were not an appropriate use of funding, the units would then be responsible for paying it or find another source of funding. IVC Monroe Gorden answered Student Affairs would be responsible. The possibility of finding another source of funding is not there. 80-85% of all funding with Student Affairs are student service fees. All other funding sources are already used elsewhere. If the recommendation is to not take new student services fees funds, it then becomes a cut for Student Affairs.
     4. ***Jazz Kiang*** asked:
        1. How is the UCOP tax being used at OP
        2. Do other UC campuses use student services fees to cover the UCOP tax for their campuses
        3. Is the rate that is charged the same across campuses
           1. AVC Jeff Roth stated the central headquarters for the university provides services for all the campuses. This includes investment services, government relations, working with the state, compliance activities, now payroll services center. The amount for UCLA is about 75 million. This is based on total expenditures and total number of staff. Student services fees supports Student Affairs. The Chancellor pays 50% of the tax. The other 50% is followed by the principle. Research would need to be conducted to find charge rates for other campus.
           2. ***Paolo Velasco*** asked what the committee could do to ensure that SSF funds going to UCOP are used in appropriate ways. Is it appropriate to give SSF funds to UCOP and if so, how much towards what. AVC Jeff Roth stated that there are reports that can show this data on the UCOP website.
           3. ***Nicole Ngaosi*** stated that APB made a comment a few weeks back that the committee should not focus on the details of the proposals, rather to focus on whether or not the merits of the program are good. She stated that the proposals that the committee are currently reviewing are not up to standards. The quality of the proposals have gone down from last year and feel incomplete. ***Karen Rowe*** seconds ***Nicole Ngaosi’s*** statement. IVC Monroe Gorden responded that if there are systemic things that need to be included to enhance the committees’ ability to provide recommendations, they are committed to provide the necessities. He stated that it is in the best interested to make sure to provide as much information as possible. He would like to work with the committee to get a sense of where the proposals have been lacking. Every unit has to comply with HR policies. Nothing has been submitted that has not been reviewed under campus policies.
* **Announcements**
  1. ***Jazz*** presented meeting times for spring quarter and the committee determined spring quarter meetings for Friday from 2-4pm.
  2. ***Paolo Velasco*** suggested taking APB up on their offer to model scenarios.
* **Adjournment** 
  1. A motion was made by ***Cody Trojan*** and seconded by ***Neemat Abdusemed*** to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.Meeting adjourned at ***5:00***pm.