**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

**Murphy Hall Room 2206 from 4:30-6:30pm**

**Tuesday, November 12, 2019**

**Present:**

Graduates: Brittnee Meitzenheimer, Denise Marshall, Jackie Markt-Maloney

Undergraduates: Nicole Corona Diaz (Chair), Atreyi Mitra, Paulina Macias

Administrative Reps: Carina Salazar, Associate Director, Career Center, Kevin Kilgore, Police Lieutenant, UCPD, Deb Geller, Associate Dean of Students

Faculty Rep: Karen Rowe, Professor Emerita

SFAC Advisor: Christine Wilson, Interim Director of Career Center and Executive Director of Graduate Student Resource Center (Ex-Officio)

APB Advisor: Ellen Hermann (Ex-Officio)

**Absent:**

Janay Williams, Graduate Rep

**Nicole Corona Diaz** called the meeting to order at 4:38pm.

1. **Approval of the Agenda**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** moved and **Atreyi Mitra** seconded updating and approving the agenda toreflect moving the agenda items to the following order beginning with the “Review Call Letter and Additional Documents” followed by “Review of Trend Reports” followed by “Review of Trend Reports” followed by “Ad hoc committee appointments.” With no objections, the agenda was approved by consent.
2. **Review of Handouts**
   1. “Call Letter and Unit Review Documents” Folder in Box
      1. SFAC members need to review the budget list
3. **Approval of Minutes** 
   1. **Paulina Macias** moved to approve minutes from 10.29.19 and 11.05.19. **Kevin Kilgore** seconded. With no objections, the minutes were approved.
4. **Review Call Letter and Additional Documents**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that the committee will review the letter and email that will be sent. The call letter remained the same as was approved last week, other than a highlight that was removed.
      1. **Karen Rowe** asked if guidelines, such as outlining student worker wages and FTE, were included to be consistent for each unit submission.
      2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** shared that guidelines would be included as well to ensure all units are consistent in the spreadsheet.
      3. **Deb Geller** asked if they wanted to include the 3% increase for non-student wages since they do not have merits. **Ellen Hermann** stated that SFAC could decide whether to include the 3% for students but could also clarify “for non-student staff.”
      4. **Karen Rowe** stated that we cannot include so many acronyms and need to spell out all of the names. **Ellen Hermann** agreed that she will update and spell out the acronyms.
   2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** then stated that each unit’s previously approved SSF funding PDFs and trend report will be sent to each unit.
      1. **Atreyi Mitra** asked for clarification on the second point related to student services fees (SSF). **Ellen Hermann** explained that Student Services Fees come in 20000 funds. To track mental health services, it is assigned to 20002 funds and sometimes people don’t know the difference so she wanted to clarify.
   3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** then reviewed the budget document categories which was not yet finalized. She read the listed items and removed duplicate items.
      1. **Atreyi** **Mitra** recommended to remove marketing and promotional materials.
      2. **Ellen Hermann** clarified that even if categories are removed, units may still request the items but will list the items as a vague or inconsistent name which could be difficult to understand.
      3. **Deb Geller** had a question about transportation and travel and whether SFAC should clarify that SFAC will consider requests to replace vehicles for community service and student initiated programs but will not provide travel for staff members. **Carina Salazar** stated that she assumed the travel section was for geared towards staff. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that SFAC could add this in the item to the “will not be considered” section. **Ellen Hermann** clarified that whatever was on the list, above the “will not consider section,” will also be included in the budget spreadsheet.
      4. **Karen Rowe** asked if they were duplicating audiovisual listed items and stated that the Office of Technology Center (OTC) has a cycle for replacing computers. Therefore, SFAC should not fund electronic equipment or computers since it is part of the allocation to OTC. **Ellen Hermann** stated that people will still need this category for the request. **Karen Rowe** clarified that OTC needs that section but not the other units because it could be confusing for units.
         1. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** stated that if they had not filled out the category before, they won’t be filling out the category and if they do, SFAC wouldn’t fund it.
         2. **Christine Wilson** stated that she did not know until a year ago, that Student Affairs departments needed to go through SAIT (previously OTC) for computers.
         3. **Ellen Hermann** stated that it may be specific for Student Affairs but should still include this line in the guidelines.
         4. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** asked that if a program wanted to provide opportunities to do filmmaking, would they have to go through OTC. **Deb Geller** stated that SAIT’s role is limited to desktop hardware within Student Affairs. She recommended the following language: Other than through SAIT units, no computers, monitors, tablets, or printers will be considered.
         5. **Ellen Hermann** stated that although units within Student Affairs need to go through SAIT, it doesn’t mean SFAC won’t fund it for other units.
      5. **Denise** **Marshall** stated that program for a camera is different from a camera itself. **Ellen Hermann** recommended that SFAC add software to electronic equipment/software/audiovisual which would incorporate **Denise** **Marshall’s** point.
      6. **Karen Rowe** stated that tech services goes through SAIT and recommended that SFAC not support outside contracts and vendors. **Christine Wilson** stated that Career Center uses a vendor that students interact with and SAIT would not be able to build for job listings. **Nicole Corona Diaz** will remove this section.
   4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** then moved to the “will not considered” section.
      1. **Atreyi Mitra** asked to move promotional and marketing materials to this section. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** stated that the marketing may be used towards student programs and events and would prefer to keep this section. **Ellen Hermann** stated that marketing materials could mean fancy brochures that are high cost and not valuable or may be low cost and market student programs as **Jackie Markt-Maloney** mentioned. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** stated that there may be some value on how they were using the funds such as brochures that are multi-year use. **Karen Rowe** stated that SFAC was encouraging units to switch marketing methods towards using electronic media since it reaches a larger audience and noted that this is how students access materials. **Atreyi Mitra** wanted to acknowledge the importance of marketing but given SFAC’s limited funding this year, funding should go towards other services. **Kevin Kilgore** stated that SFAC needs to decide whether to keep this item or not but it is not SFAC’s decision on how units then use the funding for marketing. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** shared from her experience that although electronic marketing is cost efficient, there may be issues with access and accessibility of these marketing items. **Karen Rowe** asked to move marketing to “communication/mail” section. **Atreyi Mitra** felt those groups are too different. **Deb Geller** clarified that communication includes funds such as Case Managers who have their cell phones funded so they can be reached in case of emergencies. **Atreyi Mitra** felt, based on that clarification, that the sections should be different.
      2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee for how the committee would like to move forward using an unofficial straw poll vote. SFAC had 4 votes to keep “marketing and promotional materials” as is and there were 5 votes to move the “marketing and promotional materials” to the “will not fund” section. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** clarified that if they kept marketing on the list, SFAC would not necessarily have to fund the request.
   5. Regarding **Deb Geller’s** travel and transportation concern, **Deb Geller** recommended changing #1 to “speaker honorarium and travel expenses” and #3 to “staff travel expenses.”
      1. **Karen Rowe** recommended that transportation includes using “university transport vehicles” so students were covered by insurance and liability.
      2. **Kevin Kilgore** reiterated his point that SFAC provides recommendations for funding but not to determine whether students drive in private vehicles or university vehicles.
   6. **Nicole Corona Diaz** clarified that there were two separate sections for professional development for professional non-career staff and professional development for students.
      1. **Karen Rowe** stated that she didn’t see a big divorce between those two and doesn’t think they need to be separate.
      2. **Deb Geller** felt there should be student professional development and non-career staff professional development. When there is requirement for them to maintain their licensure, if SFAC is the sole resource, we should be able to provide the option to request the funding.
      3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee their thoughts and with no comments, she would include two separate sections: student and non-career staff.
         1. **Karen Rowe** asked who would be included as non-career staff because not all require professional development on a regular basis. She stated that SFAC does not fund attorneys. **Carina Salazar** clarified that SFAC funds the lawyers in BRC for undocumented students.
   7. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that the categories are set. This concludes the review of all attachments. **Nicole Corona Diaz** will make the changes in the guidelines and send the call letter and will copy SFAC members in the emails. If there are any concerns, please share comments via email.
5. **Review of Trend Reports**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** shared that the trend report will be attached to each unit’s call letter so they know what SFAC will be reviewing along with their materials. Trend reports include carry forward, which may not be up to date, but advised that the ending balance is from June and may not be accurate but the directors could clarify. **Karen Rowe** stated that one of the problems with trend reports is one of the categories for budgets, and the size of the material and supplies section is ominous. **Nicole Corona Diaz** shared that it’s too late to break it down any further but is a good point for the future. **Ellen Hermann** stated that depending on the timeline, she may be able to assist depending on which section within materials and supplies would need to be broken down. **Karen Rowe** added to break down staffing to see which were students and staff.
6. **Ad hoc committee appointments**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** shared that previously, she and **Denise Marshall** were in Project Review Group (PRG), last year which is a separate committee that two SFAC members that meets once a quarter to approve funding for special projects. Last year, there was a proposal to fix slippery floors of a bathroom in John Wooden and the committee approved funding. **Christine Wilson** stated that SFAC contributes a certain amount of money each year together with other campus partners to take care of pressing maintenance type issues.
   2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** would like to identify two SFAC student members to sit on the committee. After she requests more details on the commitment, she’d like to select two students next meeting.
7. **Discussion of Master Student Amendment to the Charter**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** shared that a couple of weeks ago, SFAC approved the eligibility for second year transfer students to serve on SFAC. Currently, students are required to serve on SFAC for two years, which excluded second transfer students. The Chancellor approved SFAC’s amendment. From this discussion, another topic regarding the exclusion of Master students arose as well. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the discussion.
      * 1. **Christine Wilson** shared from her experience that she has never seen a transfer student on the committee but many Master’s students.
        2. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** asked for clarification. **Christine Wilson** shared that the state is creating many one-year Master programs that are self-supporting programs for which, these students may not be a good fit for the committee. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** is unsure how these students are unfit for serving on the committee since they pay student fees as well.
        3. **Ellen Hermann** stated that she understands that when **Christine Wilson** said that these students’ experiences might be very different from a traditional students, she is correct in that there are some self-supporting programs that may not be on campus in the way a traditional student is – their program might be online and students might not set foot on campus, or only part-time or on weekends and some of those programs do not assess the student services fee. However, there are also self-supporting programs with students who are on campus and do pay the student services fee.
        4. **Deb Geller** stated that GSA does a great job during the summer to find interested students including new graduate students. There are plenty of two-year Master students on committees due to early outreach in summer. She felt it would be unreasonable to expect individual student or GSA to differentiate which graduate students are paying or not paying student services fee. She also shared that it’s not appropriate to make a change to include a student in a one-year program who doesn’t pay the student services fee nor experience the services to assess their value. Also professional programs may not understand the need for these services. She did not see the parallels between transfer students, who can’t be appointment until they begin classes, whereas Master’s students have been appointment to SFAC previously. This change would affect continuity for one-year appointments.
        5. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** understood the concern with the one-year term appointment. She shared that she started her PhD program and switched to a Master’s program and did not hear about SFAC until her third year. She stated that there still may be gaps in recruitment that eliminates folks from participating in this committee.
        6. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** agreed because she is a two-year Master’s program. She felt there was a double standard to have transfer students participate as a one-year term but not the Master’s students. She asked if there was a way around the concern of Master’s students who aren’t paying the student services fee by getting a list of eligible programs.
        7. **Christine Wilson** shared that this has been an issue for the Graduate Student Resource Center and Graduate Writing Center because they are funded by referendum. There were some issues but they met with the Registrar that all new programs would be paid through the student service fees.
        8. **Ellen Hermann** shared that APB could provide information on which programs pay SSF. She shared that when advising the Chancellor on the transfer amendment, it was important to be inclusive of the campus community but her office also raised the concern of continuity. For example, prior to **Jackie Markt-Maloney** joining the committee, **Atreyi Mitra** was the only person eligible to be Chair next year due to term requirements.
        9. **Karen Rowe** shared that when USAC and GSA are identifying SFAC students, they are looking for students who are knowledgeable and deeply engaged. She doesn’t feel it is about excluding any particular group but when there is a sizable pool of expertise, it benefits the committee to bring these students in. It took her two years to feel comfortable in the issues SFAC confronts. She recommends encouraging two-year commitments.
        10. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** felt the narrative from transfer students is now completely opposite for Master’s students. SFAC members stated that transfer students could bring their knowledge of budget from their previous institution but the argument isn’t being made for Master’s students who may have experience as well.
        11. **Paulina Macias** felt all points shared were good but the amendment for transfer students was made as an exception for one student and believes it is unfair that when the concern for Master’s students is brought up, it is not being considered.
        12. **Nicole Corona Diaz** added that although there was a specific student for the transfer change, the committee should also consider the Master’s student amendment to be inclusive of all students. Regardless whether the transfer student would be appointment or not, it provides the opportunity for transfer students in the future. She also clarified that the concern of one-year terms and continuity of members should not be a concern and is only an issue this year due to turnover and transition of previous committee members.
        13. **Carina Salazar** further clarified that if both changes to appointment one-year transfer and Master’s students is approved, **Atreyi Mitra** would still be the only member eligible for chair next year.
        14. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** responded that SFAC can communicate their concern to GSA and USAC that they have only appointed one-year term students who will not be eligible to be chair.
        15. **Atreyi Mitra** asked if this change would be applied to only one-year Master’s students and/or to those who are in their second-year Master’s program. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** heard the concerns with continuity but with four GSA appointments, there could be two Master’s one-year appointments. **Kevin Kilgore** seconds the point.
        16. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee what the language may look like to draft an amendment change.
            1. **Deb Geller** suggested the following amendments: GSA may appoint a Master’s student in the final year of their program for a one-year term. If the student’s eligibility changes and they become eligible to serve a second year on the committee, they shall be nominated to carry out the second-year. If their eligibility does not change, GSA may appoint another student for the remainder one-year appointment to complete the two-year term. Also, each year, USAC and GSA must appoint at least one student to a two-year term.
            2. **Karen Rowe** asked if SFAC has discussed this with GSA to gather their input. **Nicole Corona Diaz** will make a note.
            3. **Kevin Kilgore** recommended that SFAC make a decision.
            4. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** suggested the following language change “that in the case that one undergraduate transfer or one-year Master’s student” so that SFAC is clear that they are making an exception because it states that members must serve a two-year term. She also liked the idea that they must appoint a two-year person because a problem with saying that people have to have a one or two-year term is that it doesn’t keep everyone from graduating at the same time.
8. **Announcements** 
   1. **N/A**
9. **Adjournment**
   1. **Kevin Kilgore** moved to adjourn the meeting, **Denise Marshall** seconded**.** With no objections, the meeting adjourned at 6:28pm.