**Student Fee Advisory Committee**

**12:00-2:00pm**

**Friday, April 5, 2021**

**Virtual Meeting**

**Attendees:**

Graduates: **Jackie Markt-Maloney, Gaby Barrios, Laxman Dahal**

Undergraduates: **Atreyi Mitra, Bradley Alvarado, Devanee Matcham, Samantha Solemnidad**

Administration: **Charles Turner,** **Erinn McMahan**

Faculty Rep: N/A

SFAC Advisor: **Christine Wilson**

APB Advisor: **David Navar**

Absent: **Paarth Shah,** **Carina Salazar**

**Atreyi Mitra** called the meeting to order at 12:00pm.

1. **Community Sharing**
	1. SFAC members shared a memory that brings them joy.
2. **Approval of Agenda**
	1. **Bradley Alvarado** motioned and **Laxman Dahal** seconded to approve the agenda.
3. **Approval of Minutes for Winter 2021 Week 10**
	1. The minutes were not ready to be approved.
4. **Review temporary funding requests in unit review groups**
	1. SFAC members went into break out rooms to discuss temporary funding requests. **David Navar** reiterated Ellen Hermann’s recommendation that SFAC should determine whether to fund benefits and merits for Student Affairs, which then determines how much funding is left to be allocated. This year, there were no merit increases and next year, there is no guarantee there will be merits but there may be a 1.5% that needs to be covered. **Christine Wilson** also shared that the Office of the President typically asks the UC’s to create a 3% merit pool. She also added that there are represented staff that have contracts that may indicate raises and if these positions are SSF, it needs to be covered.
5. **Post-break out room discussion**
	1. **Samantha Solemnidad** summarized that the group reviewed Spirit Squad and Career Center which were funded previously. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** added that the group focused on continuing requests rather than new requests, the unit’s order of priority for their requests, and comparing the SFAC priorities to the needs of the units.
	2. **Laxman Dahal** provided the group’s update of ECE’s requests by reviewing funding requests from previous years and for Marching Band, focusing on continuing requests rather than new requests. **Christine Wilson** added that there is a trend report for ECE which will be important for the group to review.
	3. **Gaby Barrios** provided an update that the group followed similar guidelines like the previous groups including wanting to prioritize continuing requests and career positions. It was important to fund student positions but not at the cost of career positions. Their units requested temporary funding for people’s salary and benefits. Overall, it will be a tough decision because most were staff positions. **Devanee Matcham** added that she was unable to find the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life’s temp or perm funding numbers but had a sheet of their funding staff. **Christine Wilson** shared updated information regarding units’ temp and perm funding numbers with SFAC.
	4. **Atreyi Mitra** providing an update for her group. The group found the following requests as important. The BRC’s first priority was to provide support to undocumented students, specifically staff and student workers which is in alignment with SFAC. Rent for transfer and veterans was important to support students although funds were not there. CPO had three temp requests for a math success program, and administrative analyst and a leadership fellowship program, which is an opportunity for students to be paid for unpaid internships. Given context of limited funding, **Atreyi Mitra** felt similar programs such as the math success program exists in AAP and geared toward a similar demographic. In comparison to supporting BRC, she felt transfer student support was a high priority. SOLE submitted requests for undergrad and grad staff. UCLA Rec’s review was very comprehensive and is requesting staff for the IM fields. **Charles Turner** added the framework the group took and ranking that was provided by the unit helped them to anticipate the responses. The group felted challenged because some units had very comprehensive, data-driven submissions but the requests may not align some of the SFAC priorities while others lacked information in their submissions but are closer aligned with SFAC priorities. One way to recognize strong submissions may be providing partial funding.
	5. **Erinn McMahan** asked the question that if a unit is not funded this year, whether their requests for the next year be considered new funding because it wouldn’t be considered continuing. **Christine Wilson** shared that for units that receive partial funding, it means SFAC supports the unit. However, she would not consider the request as new if it received funding previously, even though it was not funded the most recent year.
6. **Discussion on letter to the Chancellor**
	1. **Atreyi Mitra** opened the floor to discuss next steps after completing the unit reviews such as providing feedback or drafting a letter to the Chancellor. **Christine Wilson** shared that previously, units received some feedback regarding their unit reviews. If there are any larger issues that arise or emerges from the process, that could result in a letter to the Chancellor. **Gaby Barrios** agreed that providing feedback to the units will be valuable but was unsure about what would need to be provided to the Chancellor. **Christine Wilson** provided examples of concerning scenarios that SFAC would share about the units to the Chancellor. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** added that after the feedback is collected, SFAC may see trends that can be summarized in a report to the Chancellor. **Atreyi Mitra** added that a letter to the Chancellor can highlight and recognize units.
	2. **Atreyi Mitra** asked if SFAC wanted to discuss anything else. **Christine Wilson** shared that it would be useful for SFAC to discuss benefits and shortfall, but not necessarily have to decide immediately. **David Navar** shared that if they don’t fund benefits and shortfalls, the funding could go towards units SFAC thinks can use it. If SFAC does not provide funding for benefits and shortfalls, that would be a hit to Student Affairs because they would have to fund it themselves. **Charles Turner** added that if SFAC’s approach is to provide no funding, then it is a signal that it is not a supported program or initiative. Whereas, providing partial funding at least says SFAC supports this but may have funding shortfalls. He shared that one approach could be uniformly deciding not to fund benefit shortfalls across the board and have units utilize their reserves. He shared that it would be a mixed signal to fund some while not funding others. **Christine Wilson** shared that the benefit shortfalls is not just Student Affairs but rather any SSF funded staff position. **Christine Wilson** reiterated if SFAC members are unsure about the benefit shortfalls when completing their spreadsheets to do one for $1million and one for $1.4million. She thinks it’s important for SFAC to understand more about the topic of benefit shortfalls and what is most fiscally sound and meeting critical needs.
7. **Announcements**
	1. PRG Updates
		1. **Laxman Dahal** shared that the PRG group met a month ago and discussed the projects and requests that were received. The group identified high priority projects and made some decisions on what they didn’t want to fund this year. **Erinn McMahan** shared that the committee also expressed concerns that there are some projects that are not funded but should be that are potentially urgent or impactful. The committee shared that pool needed more money at some point to address the infrastructure needs. This may be mentioned in a letter to the Chancellor. **Christine Wilson** asked if **Erinn McMahan** could identify the funding sources from for PRG. **Erinn McMahan** shared that it comes from Chancellorial, SSF, and Recreation membership sales over the summer.
		2. **Christine Wilson** shared as a next step that SFAC needs to draft a recommendation response. **Laxman Dahal** recommends to approve the PRG funding recommendations because it covers essential projects including the sand filter and pool. **Samantha Solemnidad** also agrees to approve the recommendations because of the thorough discussion and the decisions made because the requests exceeded the amount they had. **Erinn McMahan** acknowledged his own bias on this topic but also appreciated what **Laxman Dahal** and **Samantha Solemnidad** shared, and he also approves.
		3. **Laxman Dahal** motioned and **Samantha Solemnidad** seconded to vote to approve the PRG recommendation**.** There were 9 votes to approve and no votes against or abstain. The recommendation has passed. **Christine Wilson** shared that next steps were to provide an informal update to Nurit and draft the PRG letter recommendation to the Chancellor.
	2. Scheduling sub-committee meetings
		1. SFAC Charter and Bylaws sub-committee was scheduled.
		2. SFAC Compensation and Accountability Policy sub-committee was scheduled.
8. **Samantha Solemnidad** motioned and **Gaby Barrios** seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 1:47pm.