**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

**2325 Murphy Hall**

**4:30-6:30 PM**

**Tuesday, January 8, 2019**

**Present:**

Graduates: Jazz Kiang, Javier Rodriguez, Zak Fisher

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

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

Faculty Rep: Karen Rowe, Professor (late 6:00pm)

APB Advisor: Ellen Hermann (Ex-Officio)

SFAC Advisor: Marilyn Alkin (Ex-Officio)

**Absent**:

Denise Marshall, Graduate

**Call to Order**

* 1. **Jazz Kiang** called the meeting to order at 4:33pm.
1. **Approval of Agenda**
	1. **Christina Wang** moved to approve the agenda. **Paulina Macias** seconded. With no objections, the agenda was approved by consent.
2. **Review of Handouts**
	1. N/A

1. **Review and Approve Minutes**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** moved to approve the minutes on 11/20/18. **Javier Rodriguez** seconded. With no objections, the minutes were approved by consent.
	2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** moved to approve the minutes on 11/27/18. **Christina Wang** seconded. With no objections, the minutes were approved by consent.
	3. **Barbara Wilson** moved to table the minutes on 12/04/18. **Neemat Abdusemed** seconded. With no objections, the minutes were tabled by consent.
2. **Unit Presentation: Student Conduct**
	1. **Jazz Kiang** opened the floor for **Deb Geller’s** Unit Presentation - Student Conduct (PPT on the projector)
	2. SFAC Presentation: Department 4805
		1. Dean of Student’s Organizational Structure
		2. Student Grievance and Hearing
			1. Mission and Purpose
				1. To support students who have grievances
				against the University
				2. To support students who are going through
				the student conduct hearing process
		3. Changes in use of SSF funds over time
			1. Staffing
				1. Dean of Students’ organizational structure has evolved over past 5 years
				2. Before 2016, parts of this function were funded on FS 4804
				3. For more transparent record keeping, employee who performs this function transferred from FS 4804 in 2016 (with funding)
				4. Benefits funding shown as Temp Appropriation
			2. Operations
				1. Program expenses include space for training of program volunteers, refreshments, supplies for hearings, and mail/messenger services. Budget is $2500/year
				2. 1-time expense in 2017 (travel): New employee was sent to week-long training institute to improve service to students
		4. Types of Grievances
			1. Discrimination or harassment on basis of disability, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or other protected class *(policies 230.1 and 230.2)*
			2. Violation of privacy rights, or inaccurate information in official student records *(policy 220.1)*
			3. Holds placed for nonpayment of debts the student denies owing *(policy 210.1)*
			4. Grievance Report Table:
				1. 2015-16: 2 grievances reported
				2. 2016-17: 3 grievances reported
				3. 2017-18: 21 grievances reported (spike due to training)
		5. Student Conduct Hearing
			1. Matters are referred when the Office of Student Conduct is unable to resolve them
			2. Train and supervise a corps of volunteers who support students going through the process
			3. Train volunteer committee members (students, faculty, staff, alumni) to ensure fair hearings
		6. Benefits of the Program
			1. Student volunteers on SCC develop leadership skills, communication skills, analytical skills, and gain experience relevant for law school and other chosen professions
			2. Services of volunteer advocates help minimize stress on students referred for hearings, and ensure students have cost-free option to getting support from attorneys
	3. **Jazz Kiang** opened the floor for questions:
		1. **Barbara Wilson** asked about the new student procedure. **Deb Geller** explained that the procedure 230.2 for student grievances alleging disability based discrimination or harassment or retaliation was issued and they did campus wide training in early 2017, which resulted in the spike of reports.
		2. **Zak** **Fisher** asked if it was a 50/50 split with the hearings and if there were findings of violations. He also asked how the process works itself out. **Deb Geller** explained that she does not have that data to provide. Jasmine Rush would be able to provide those numbers. **Deb Geller** explained that she oversees the preparation before the hearings. She added that it is not a given that students would be found in violation. Findings are a case-by-case matter; year-by-year. Every case is fact specific.
		3. **Neemat** **Abdusemed** asked what policies were the majority of grievances reported. **Deb Geller** explained that the majority of the reports were under policy

230.2 -Discrimination or harassment on basis of disability, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or other protected class.

* + 1. **Jazz Kiang** asked given that there are more investigations related to ADA Compliance, have some of those investigations sparked an institutional priority to meet that need. **Deb Geller** explained what has sparked is an institutional commitment to collaboration to meet that need. Previously a single investigator did all investigations. Now they have a partnership with the Discrimination and Prevention office, who report to Vice Chancellor Jerry Kang and the Compliance office through Human Resources for staff matters.
1. **Unit Presentation: Graduate Student Resource Center**
	1. **Jazz Kiang** opened the floor for **Christine Wilson’s** Unit Presentation - Graduate Student Resource Center.
	2. **Christine Wilson** explained that a way to see how GSRC is doing is by looking at their trend report. The reason why there was money left over was due to instability. The mission of the GSRC is to help graduate students enter into the university in the best possible way and to make sure students have proper resources and information at the university and while transitioning out. This groups the career and professional development side, both in the Writing Center and the Career Center, with what the GSRC does in bringing them together. This helps with centralizing and not duplicating services. The challenges that GSRC had were: **Christine Wilson** being assigned other duties; the Assistant Director going on leave; uncertainty for funding of the Admin Specialist; and not getting any admin support services. Getting bills paid and paper work complete was a vast issue. Some of the carryforward reflected bills that were paid, people on leave and hiring funds. The main issue and challenge was the GSRC not having a permanent budget. How GSRC plans to prioritize: Continuation of the Admin Specialist position; Anchor events--like orientation, EID, and Program Committee--which are led by graduate student staff. **Christine Wilson** noted that graduate students often feel isolated in the Student Activities Center because many other services in the building are undergraduate-focused. Graduate students have their own needs. GSRC programs are funded by SFAC. She added being in the Student Activities Center builds a community for students who may not be finding it elsewhere and can help find their larger community by offering them support. They also offer opportunities for professional development. Regarding mental health, GSRC makes sure grad students get their daily needs met that acquire concern. The goal is to help students move and transition smoothly and find jobs.
	3. **Jazz Kiang** opened the floor for questions:
	4. **Jazz Kiang** asked how last year’s unsuccessful referendum has caused reflection for how graduate students value and understand the GSRC and GWC. **Christine Wilson** expressed it was a mistake to run a referendum last year and was moment of reflection of the way it happened. If that were to happen again, there would need to be more student effort and greater external focus from higher leadership.
	5. **Deb Geller** asked if the grad division was still passing through the return to aid portion of the Writing Center funding. **Christine Wilson** said yes.
2. **Unit Presentation: Career Center**
	1. **Jazz Kiang** opened the floor for **Christine Wilson’s** Unit Presentation -Career Center.
	2. **Christine Wilson** expressed that the even though Career Center is a part of Student Affairs; they have not benefited from the changes and is “out of date.” Career Center does privilege certain industries and majors, which mean privileging a certain group of students. Career Center is not looking at the future of work. She questioned what are students doing. What do they want to do. Where are they going when they are done. Career Center is not providing these opportunities. A huge priority is to shift this change and to look at how things are being operated. Set new goals. Career Center’s mission is to help students explore what they want to do, gain skills and knowledge to take with them when they transition, discover internships and guide students to get the right job. Career Center is not going about this the right way. Their areas of focus are: Serving all students, partnerships, 24/7 Career Center, internships and student outreaches. Regarding carryforward - Carryforward did not come from any temporary allocations. It came from funds originally allocated for a governmental internship, which stalled for 3 years. She looked into how they could use the money more effectively and built a 3-year plan. Starting last year, instead of giving funds just for UCDC, they decided to work with UC Sacramento programs. Other carryforward funds come from people on leave and open positions.
	3. **Jazz Kiang** opened the floor for questions:
	4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked about the non-profit Government Career Fair and asked if it was similar to a Career Night. **Christine Wilson** explained that it is hosted by the Alumni Association and Career Center partners with them. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked would the Alumni Center be willing to participate in order to subsidize the cost and fees that non-profit organizations have to pay. **Christine Wilson** explained that their struggle for funds is similar to theirs. However, working with them as a collaboration would be a benefit. (**Christine Wilson** passed out a handout. She explained the things she could take off the table, if SFAC could not fund them).
	5. **Mike Cohn** asked about the change and focus of the Career Center regarding outreach and meeting students out. Does the Career Center have the support staff. Would the Career Center have to provide additional training. How will the center determine where to go. **Christine Wilson** explained in terms of development, most students have a master’s degree in counseling or in Student Affairs and understand the work. They are happy to engage. In terms of how the center will be shifting things, there will be a shift with the counselor’s 1:1 sessions. Career Center has also asked SAIRO to organize their data.
	6. **Barbara** **Wilson** asked about the data about serving 10,000 students. However, on the handout it states 30,902 student engagement. Where is the difference. **Christine Wilson** explained is has to do with Career Fair.
	7. **Christina Wang** asked about the implementation of the Handshake.Asked if it was a good investment. **Christine Wilson** explained it was a tremendous investment because of the number of jobs offered. In terms of the resources, it was useful. However, they do not know what happens after, is if person gets the job, etc. because they are unable to track who gets employment.
	8. **Neemat Abdusemed** expressed her experience with the Career Center and trying to get an appointment with the long wait time. She asked how has the Career Center been able to navigate the high demand. What are the issues they have run into. How have the issues been remedied. **Christine Wilson** explained that many students go to the Career Center for issues that they do not have an appointment for. Employees spend a lot of time teaching students how to use Handshake, which is not a good use of their time. Providing 24/7 Career Center will assist with these needs. Being able to put everything on Handshake will also assist with these needs, freeing Career Counselors time for appointments.
3. **UC Non-Resident Enrollment Cap Discussion**
	1. **Jazz Kiang** askedthe committee to read and discuss the “Supplemental Report of the 2018-19 Budget Act” document.
	2. **Zak Fisher** expressed that it is a bad idea because this would class divide residents’ vs non-residents that already exists. This would make things worse, as it states making tuition higher for them and keeping the tuition the same for everyone else, attracting richer out of states students. He believed that document was a garbage. This is symptomatic parasite that is in our political minds that a division needs to be made.
	3. **Deb Geller** asked if anyone knew the percentage of the use of non-resident vs residents’. **Ellen Hermann** stated last year it was 22.8%.
	4. **Jazz Kiang** stated a year ago, the Regents voted to cap non-resident undergraduate enrollment to 18% for UC campuses. It has been grandfathered in that UCLA cannot exceed 22% in non-resident enrollment. This initially caused a stir because of a revenue issue. However, the state legislature has made expectations for a 10% cap plan. He asked the committee what their thoughts were regarding the revenue issue. **Deb Geller** expressed that this would be a significant reduction and would make the cost of a non-resident exorbitant. There are already challenges with students who arrive with one set of fees. There already is not enough financial aid for students who are from out of state, undergrads, and international students and it would have a negative impact in the classroom.
	5. **Barbara Wilson** pointed out a section of the document that stated “including but not limited to,” which means some of the revenue would not be coming from student fees at all, which means less money that will going to the SFAC “pot.”
	6. **Jazz Kiang** stated that the political context behind this is that legislators want to show that they are for CA residents.
4. **Announcements**
	1. **Ellen Hermann** announced that the amount of the onetime funding from the SSF unallocated account is $742,000. Mental health will also get $742,000. This will be a onetime funding on the 19900 fund, which is the general fund not the student services fee fund, which is typically 20000 fund. **Jazz Kiang** added that this was framed as a buyout last year that the state would cover what would have been a 5% increase in student services fees. He asked how the mental health funds would be used. He asked if they would be going to CAPS. **Ellen Hermann** stated that funds would probably be sent to the account that mental health funding was normally sent to, which is associated with CAPS, but if the committee feels otherwise they should express this in a letter to the Chancellor **Javier Rodriguez** asked if the mental health funds would be allocated were the only funds for mental health services only or would it be going to CAPS in addition to what they proposed to the committee. **Ellen Hermann** stated that this would be a separate or in addition to any request and their permanent budget. This would be just as normally half of the increase in SSF funds would be going to mental health. **Jazz Kiang** added that CAPS did not submit a request for any temporary funds.
	2. **Marilyn Alkin** announced that conference 2325 Murphy Hall would be the committees’ meeting location for the quarter.

1. **Adjournment**
	1. **Christina Wang** moved to adjourn the meeting. **Paulina Macias** seconded. With no objections, **Jazz Kiang** adjourned the meeting at 6:31pm.