**`Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

**2325 Murphy Hall**

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

**Tuesday, November 27, 2018**

**Present:**

Graduates: Jazz Kiang, Javier Rodriguez, Denise Marshall

Graduate Nominee: Zak Fisher

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

Administration: Deb Geller, Associate Dean of Students and Deputy Title IX Coordinator, Barbara Wilson, UCLA Housing & Hospitality

APB Advisor: Ellen Hermann (Ex-Officio)

Faculty Rep: Karen Rowe, Professor

SFAC Advisor: Marilyn Alkin (Ex-Officio)

**Absent:** Mike Cohn, Director of SOLE

1. **Call to order** 
   1. **Jazz Kiang** called the meeting called to order at 5:04pm
2. **Approval of Agenda**
   1. **Jazz Kiang** requested to amend the agenda and remove the agenda item to approve the minutes from Thursday, November 20th.
   2. **Christina Wang** moved to approve the agenda as amended. **Denise Marshall** seconded.
3. **Review of Handouts**
4. **Review and Approve Minutes**
5. **Preparation for unit presentations**
   1. **Jazz Kiang** stated that next week the committee will begin presentations from SOLE, Spirit Squad, and Student Legal Services. **Jazz Kiang** stated that Student Legal Services falls under group 3; Christina Wang, Barbara Wilson, Denise Marshall , SOLE falls under group 4; Paulina Macias & Jazz Kiang , Spirit Squad is group 2; Nicole Corona Diaz, Javier Rodriguez, and Karen Rowe. **Jazz Kiang** stated that all documents will be received on Thursday and the subcommittees will receive them on Friday. **Jazz Kiang** also stated he would like the committee to be an expert if it’s a particular subcommittees area or entity that will be presenting on that week and to read the documents in full with hopes that the subcommittees will be reviewing the trend reports. **Jazz Kiang** stated that based off of last week the committee discussed taking notes constructively and Jazz Kiang put together a worksheet. **Jazz Kiang** stated that the worksheet has a number of questions that can be used as presentations are happening to take notes on certain items and these questions are adapted from what was sent to directors. **Jazz Kiang** stated an electric version is also available through google forms and would prefer that members of the committee use the electronic setting.
   2. **Jazz Kiang** showed the committee how to access Google Forms, how to read the trend reports, and what to look for.
   3. **Jazz Kiang** stated that the questions are what was sent out in the guidelines but was changed to a question format for the committee to review. **Jazz Kiang** stated that if you are an expert on the submission and have useful information it would be helpful to add that information to the Google Form. **Jazz Kiang** stated the presentations are limited in time and stated the document does ask if additional questions need to be asked as follow-up questions. **Jazz Kiang** stated that he does not want this to be an extra burden of work but would like this to keep the committee accountable, so that the information is useful when the committee gets to the budgetary deliberations. **Zak Fisher** stated he feels good with the questions on the documents.
6. **Ad hoc subcommittees update and reports**
   1. **The Governing Documents s**ubcommittee reviewed the charter.
      1. **Christina Wang** stated there were very minimal edits and stated the registration fee was replaced by Student Services Fee within the document. **Javier Rodriguez** asked the committee if they can make a recommendation to allow transfer students to participate on the SFAC committee. **Neemat Abdusemed** stated that last year the committee discussed that fixing it in the by-law and the charter would not be efficient and should be more efficient for USAC to promote the committee on their end, especially 1-year positions. **Christina Wang** stated that a 1-year term would not be very efficient, as its such steep learning curve and the first year is a learning year. **Deb Geller** stated that transfers could be appointed as applications are advertised typically in May or June and for this committee positions are not filled until the middle of summer, they just have to be appointed by the Chancellor before orientation. **Deb Geller** stated that transfers have the ability to apply just like incoming freshman and lots of freshmen were appointed to committees without any prior experience. **Deb Geller** stated that part of the challenge is just the culture of being a transfer student and having to jump right in as an upper division student, for many are not living on campus, so there are other challenges but it is open and could be an opportunity for transfer students. **Deb Geller** stated there is nothing structural that could prevent it since the appointments don’t have to be made until the end of summer and all committee opportunities are shared at the Transfer Student Orientation. **Deb Geller** stated applications are open until the committees are filled. **Denise Marshall** recommended to speak with USAC when it comes to transfer students. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that she thinks it mostly has to do with the deadlines that the USAC president sets as they typically set three weeks before the deadlines due and requesting them to extend that until June. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that otherwise maybe transfers are barely getting their acceptance notifications and allowing them the time to make that commitment. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that it’s not the most efficient fix but gives transfers the opportunities to apply and hear about it. **Deb Geller** stated she isn’t sure if USAC is aware of these deadlines and typically makes appointments based upon when the committee's orientation is. **Jazz Kiang** stated that the purpose of the July 15th deadline is to allow the Chancellor time to approve of the candidate. **Karen Rowe** stated that she would imagine the Transfer Center has on the website different opportunities for political engagement and this would be part of that and could be available on a regular basis to see deadlines and application processes. **Jazz Kiang** stated that this is not final by any means but wanted to have this discussion so every ad-hoc subcommittee can give an update eventually in the future when the committee has time in a meeting agenda and he will put things on the agenda for the committee to finalize their vote on and then send the recommendations to the Chancellor. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated there can always be a letter provided to USAC so that they know this is a priority when looking out for applicants, that does not tell them who to choose but to state one of the committee's concerns. **Karen Rowe** stated that this kind of change is clearly under the purview of USAC. **Jazz Kiang** stated that the point should be for the committee to do their best and for the Chancellor to approve of the nominations in time.
   2. **The Governing Document Sub-Committee** reviewed the Bylaws.
      1. **Christina Wang** stated that all registration fees wording changed to Student Services Fees and where it says funding proposals and requests they replaced where it says “the committee shall send out …to coincide with the Chancellor’s annual call letter”. **Jazz Kiang** stated the main point of the change is to eliminate the sentence that did not make sense. **Christina Wang** stated an additional change was changing the ASCULA library to ASUCLA website, instead of stipend policy it was changed to compensation and accountability policy, as the main changes are the proper names for things. **Karen Rowe** asked if Jazz Kiang is intending to vote on this next week? **Jazz Kiang** stated he is not necessarily intending on voting on these items next week.
   3. **The SSF level Sub-Committee** reviewed the SSF
      1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that this is a complex subject and the difficulty is simply about not wanting the SSF level to increase, but being on this committee you would prefer it to accommodate all of the units and right now it's hard to as funding mental health services depletes a good portion of the permanent funds that the committee has and therefore less likely to meet all the other units' requests. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated due to the growing expenditure of mental health services the sub-committee talked about the benefits of raising the SSF would have so that there is more funding for other units. **Paulina Macias** stated that it's always a struggle when focusing on when students will be affected by an increase and historically the increases have not been large numbers from one year to another, but it still effects students and the increase especially effects the middle-class students as the low-income students have financial aids and the wealthier students will pay what they have to pay. **Paulina Macias** stated an increase of the student fees is more favorable as of now but **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that the percentage of increase that will make sense and won’t make students just spend a lot more but the sub-committee discussed an increase due to their not being a sustainable source of funding for mental health services among other services as this seems to be a really huge portion of what's eating up the budget. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated the sub-committee's proposition is finding ways to continue to bring up the conversation of mental health services and how to fund them so it is not necessarily all coming out of the SSF because it's just a cost that students cannot absorb alone. **Nicole Corona Diaz** statedthe sub-committee listed one way out of many through the UC student association called a STAR advocate and students get to have more access to the Regents and advocate for different causes and in this case, it would be advocating for mental health services, the SSF level, and the need to expand it and so other universities aren't struggling to meet the needs of their units. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that the subcommittee understands that this is a complicated issue and the SSF will need to be raised at one point.
      2. **Karen Rowe** asked if the sub-committee thought about how expanding the conversation about mental health funding might engage other entities and sources of income, as CAPS also gets income from student insurance programs and adjustments in that have not been looked at as a possible additional source. **Karen Rowe** stated you never hear anything about the health sciences or medical funding as they have students that are serviced at CAPS. **Karen Rowe** stated that out of all the entities on campus they are most concerned with health and well-being and she does not know how one engages the conversation saying they should be participating and how they can mount out of their budget a number that augments the number of therapists, because SFAC hasn’t discussed the expansion that incorporates those entities. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated they had not considered that and will be something that could be looked into in the future. **Zak Fisher** stated that it’s a sick reality that we’re talking about where we will be getting mental health funding from or will we be charging students more. **Zak Fisher** stated that there are 20-30 administrators in this building hoarding hundreds of thousands of dollars and its unacceptable to have oligarchy as a nation, within the education system, and this is where the money needs to come from. **Zak Fisher** stated students are stakeholders of this university, they are not customers, and its wrong morally, its wrong fiscally, and it's just not sound policy. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that she does not disagree but that the problem right now is to accommodate every other unit that needs funding and that CAPS is depleting the amount of money. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated it's hard to look out for every other unit and what can we do as a committee on this end to help out the students. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that she is trying to create a tangible timeline to get to that point where administrators have salaries that are capped, but what can we do now as a committee to get to that long-term response. **Zak Fisher** stated that this system has become normalized, logical, rational, only because we collectively as students and for that matter every stakeholder getting paid...as they do what the governor of California does, they administrate. **Zak Fisher** stated that nothing is going to change from this committee or anywhere else for students standing together to say this is wrong, this is oligarchy. **Zak Fisher** stated that this is perverse morally, unacceptable situation and that bureaucracy is never an excuse not to do the right thing. **Zak Fisher** stated to fund everything that students ask for, reasonably, and if we go into a deficit, we have to go into a deficit, and send a letter to Chancellor Block stating that you are letting yourself get filthy rich at the expense of this school. **Zak Fisher** stated at the very least we can speak up for the right things right now, stand up for what’s right and in the interest of the students. **Jazz Kiang** stated he would like to thank the subcommittee for giving the report, as a lot of things do not live in a vacuum here. **Christina Wang** stated that even if the administrators forgoes their salary, that money will not go to SFAC as we have a very specific allocated amount as a certain number of tuitions goes towards the SSF and this will not make the SFAC budget any bigger. **Jazz Kiang** stated that with regards to mental health funding for one - it’s the recognition that we are not on a sustainable model, two - there should be other options outside of students pockets that should be financing mental health services. **Jazz Kiang** stated that this should be financed to some capacity outside of student fees. **Karen Rowe** stated that this conversation has to relate to the budgeting system being used systemwide that the funding coming from systemwide for mental health services is coming in as a one-time temporary funding and that is a discussion we can urge the Chancellor and other people to have with systemwide as this is unsustainable and simply doesn’t work. **Jazz Kiang** stated that part of what that subcommittee can consider is wording in regards to systemwide initiatives and priorities that leads to campuses having to pay for it as this is an on-going concern.
   4. **Student Services Compensation**
      * 1. **Deb Geller** stated that the committee is not at the point of proposing edits yet as they are gathering data. **Deb Geller** stated that there has been one technical edit that the policy refers to the student initiated access committee and is currently called the student initiated outreach committee and that change will need to be made. **Deb Geller** stated state the subcommittee would like to invite Jazz Kiang to communicate with the department administrators who oversee the payment of the stipends to the committee members to gather additional information. **Deb Geller** stated that the sub-committee would like to know how many members currently sit on these committees to make sure the policy allows for funding for all committee members and that there are not some being excluded by means of their being too many, wanted to get a sense if the committee is actually a funding board, and the size of the budget that it administers since that is one of the criteria set forth in the policy for determining appropriate levels, to find out how many hours members are expected to put in on average on a weekly basis since that is one of the criteria set forth in the policy for determining appropriate levels, in addition they wanted to find out if the committee meets in summer or not and if the funding from that board comes from a referendum the sub-committee would like to know the amount students pay per quarter into that funding pool, also interested in obtaining each committee’s written criteria for a member’s receipt of their stipend as they each have different criteria for determining whether someone has earned that payment or not as the sub-committee wanted to see what they are and make sure they are appropriate and consistent with the policy. **Deb Geller** stated its notable the policy calls for SFAC to consult with each of the committees before making changes and indicated that any additional committees seeking compensation needs to submit a request to SFAC. **Deb Geller** stated that it is at the very least possible that when SFAC begins the consultations to gather information the committee may see some additional committees which has been formed after the policy was last updated asking for stipends and the one that comes to mind is the Student Risk Education Committee which is now a funding board administering funding that comes out of referendum currently is not paid and the sub-committee thought there might be room for a conversation about whether the appropriate place to add stipends for new committees is in fact the funding pool that SFAC administers or if it instead SFAC might want to authorize committees to use their own funding to pay stipends consistent with policies SFAC might put in place but not offer additional funding to cover those committees. **Denise Marshall** stated that if they get their money through referendum, some of the referendum is bunched together and she is not sure how the sub-committee will be able to gather that data. **Jazz Kiang** asked Deb Geller if she could share that list with him via email to begin figuring it out. **Karen Rowe** asked what is the entity that SFAC funds that does these kinds of studies and would SAIRO be a source of doing this kind of work? **Jazz Kiang** stated that SAIRO does programmatic assessments for Student Affairs primarily, this is not being framed as a programmatic assessment per say unless the committee is choosing to empirically evaluate the role of these funding bodies but if that would be the case he is sure there would be room for SAIRO to do something but would need to put together research questions. **Karen Rowe** asked if AP&B does these kinds of studies? **Ellen Hermann** stated she is unsure what Karen Rowe means by way of “studies”, however in terms of asking these questions the easiest way is to do what Jazz Kiang suggested and email the individuals responsible for these committees and AP&B does have a research arm but this is probable the most effective way to do it.
7. **Merits and Benefits discussion**
   1. **Ellen Hermann** stated that in response to an earlier question it would be helpful to review how to look at the trend reports. **Ellen Hermann** stated for the departments that SFAC reviews that some programs that are reviewed do not fall into departments in the same way that SFAC reviews them. **Ellen Hermann** reviewed the trend reports for SOLE as an example for the committee to better understand the trend report. **Ellen Hermann** stated that in communications that is where the TIF, is technology infrastructure fee, usually hits and the payment for phones, internet, and **Deb Geller** state that wifi is included, and when SFAC gets request it typically is salary, benefits, TIFF/infrastructure and usually funds all three of those when funding a person. **Ellen Hermann** stated that there is insurance charged per person and will show-up in the services, however it is not the only service but that might be what the committee sees if there is only salary expenses and small amounts for services. **Ellen Hermann** stated that services can include a lot of other services for example, rentals and other types of services. **Barbara Wilson** stated that another example is liability insurance. **Ellen Hermann** stated that surplus and deficit is the revenue for the year minus their expenditure for the year. **Ellen Hermann** stated carryforward is what the unit is bringing in from the prior year and units are generally encouraged to spend their carryforward. **Karen Rowe** asked where will the committee see technological requests? **Ellen Hermann** stated that she believes computer expenses will show up under Information Technology but if there is a computer services it will show up under services. **Deb Geller** stated that she would like to point out temporary appropriations also include the benefits funding, **Ellen Hermann** added that this is true in Student Affairs and probably quite a few of the other departments, and **Deb Geller** stated the career staff does not imply that someone is career as opposed to contract but has to do with a full-time employee who receives full-time benefits, career-like. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked how will SFAC know how much units are being charged for rent and does that vary depending on location? **Ellen Hermann** stated that this does vary but some of the members of the committee may be more informed about the details of this. **Ellen Hermann** stated if a unit pays rental expenses it sometimes shows as operations and maintenance of plant, but it depends on how they’re being charged. **Deb Geller** stated most of the Student Affairs units do not have to pay rent but those that have sought out additional space sometimes pay a rental fee such as those located in Kerckhoff. **Ellen Hermann** stated depending on how those are paid will be displayed differently on the trend reports.
   2. **Ellen Hermann** stated that she emailed the committee and is essentially presenting a request on behalf of the SSF funded units for merits and to cover the benefit shortfalls for the next two years; 2019-2020 & 2020-2021. **Ellen Hermann** stated the merits portion is typically a 3% pool, that goes towards merit increases for the staff and generally it has only covered permanently budgeted positions, and these are typically career employees that are full time, that have a permanent role here at the university, and these are permanently budgeted. **Ellen Hermann** stated the merits are generally 3% and typically it depends on UCOP’s announcement, generally there is an amount equal of 3% of these salaries that goes into a merits pool and most units generally give about 3% to all the employees and this is not necessarily required but this is often what happens. **Ellen Hermann** stated generally, it is based on merit and does come very close to covering inflation and people that work in these positions their cost of living does go up and this is very helpful to receive these increases if they’ve been doing very well. **Ellen Hermann** stated the units generally depend on this and if they’re funding merits the funding needs to come from somewhere, if it doesn’t come from this committee they may need to cut somewhere else and this is key to keeping the staff as well. **Ellen Hermann** stated this also generally provided as perm and once it leaves the unallocated account it gets dispensed as permanent. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked if this is similar to a raise? **Ellen Hermann** stated yes, that is correct. **Ellen Hermann** stated that benefits costs go up every year especially since healthcare cost has been increasing dramatically and if units that receive SSF have a shortfall and cannot cover their benefits the committee has provided permanent funding to fill that gap. **Karen Rowe** asked what has been the trend in terms of the percentage of benefits that are not covered? **Ellen Hermann** stated that she has the total for the past 6 years and it has varied significantly and will say for both merits and benefits shortfall the low is 120,000 and the high has been 1.3million (fiscal year 2013-2014). **Ellen Hermann** stated the benefits amount vary year to year. **Ellen Hermann** stated that it depends on the number of employees, and the portion of those with families who select the most expensive package versus a single person who might pick the cheapest option. **Ellen Hermann** stated the average has been about $670,000 for both combined and has varied a lot. **Ellen Hermann** stated both of these are pretty key in compensating staff and a high priority for most of the SSF units. **Barbara Wilson** stated one does not come without the other and if you hire a staff member the benefits are automatic in terms of what the university pays to have that employee employed. **Deb Geller** stated that there is no way to reduce the amount spent on either line item it's just a matter of if it's not funded by the committee units will have to begin cutting program services or people in order to find the money to pay for the benefits and the increases for those that are eligible. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked if these merits and benefits are presented as a combination of all the units? **Ellen Hermann** stated that she is making her presentation on behalf of all the SSF units and not just Student Affairs. **Ellen Hermann** stated that the number provided was a total number of all the SSF units and that the future amounts will depend on if UCOP approves of providing merits, which has always been contingent on the Chancellors response, and in terms of benefit shortfall that amount has varied.  **Karen Rowe** discussed finding out other sources of funding and the trend report for Athletics and wanted to know until the committee knows why they did what they did then they are no longer responsible, **Ellen Hermann** stated that SFAC recommended to Athletics that they stop funding women's coaching staff on SSF funds and instead spend it on non-compensation expenses. **Ellen Hermann** stated that currently that it is being spent on non-compensation expenses, there is not permanently budgeted SSF staff and the committee will not be funding their merits or benefits and that would be coming from whatever source they are using now. **Marilyn Alkin** stated that this happened in the past and the committee recommended to the Chancellor that the Athletic department stop putting their SSF fund into positions as it was using up all the funding and it was not reasonable. **Marilyn Alkin** stated the Chancellor agreed and told the Athletic department to change their ways and there was a big change and this was a recommendation from SFAC to the Athletic department. **Marlyn Alkin** stated this recommendation was probably recommended 5 or 6 years ago but it took this amount of time for it to be implemented. **Jazz Kiang** stated that the point of this example is showing that the number can fluctuate from year to year from a wide variety of things. **Jazz Kiang** stated that whether it is today or at another time the committee will have to make a decision on this and suggested to Ellen Hermann that AP&B bring it up as an umbrella issue rather than units putting this as each of their submissions. **Barbara Wilson** stated that this goes back to asking units if they have other sources of funding, if they have additional sources of revenue to cover these costs.
   3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** moved to postpone action items on this agenda item until next week. **Denise Marshall** seconded. 6 in favor, 2 oppose, 1 abstention.
8. **Announcements**
9. **Adjournment** 
   1. **Denise Marshall** moved to adjourn. **Paulina Macias** seconded. Without any objections the meeting was adjourned at 6:57pm.