**Student Fee Advisory Committee**

**3:00-5:00pm**

**Friday, February 26, 2021**

**Virtual Meeting**

**Attendees:**

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

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

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

Faculty Rep: N/A

SFAC Advisor: **Christine Wilson**

APB Advisor: **Ellen Hermann, David Navar**

**Atreyi Mitra** called the meeting to order at 3:03pm.

1. **Community Sharing – What does home mean to you?**
	1. **Atreyi Mitra** opened the floor for the committee to share what home means to them.
2. **Approval of Agenda for Week 8 Winter Quarter 2021**
	1. **Laxman Dahal** motioned and **Devanee Matcham** seconded to approve the agenda. The agenda was approved unanimously.
3. **Approval of Minutes for Week 7 Winter Quarter 2021**
	1. **Gaby Barrios** motioned and **Bradley Alvarado** secondedto approve Week 7 minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously.
4. **SFAC Presentations**
	1. **Atreyi Mitra** opened the floor for committee members to present on their unit reviews.
		* **Atreyi Mitra –** presented ontheAshe Health and Wellness Center and the Bruin Resource Center (BRC). She shared that Ashe fits within the guidelines of health. In terms of assessment, Ashe incorporated a Student Health Advisory Committee (SHAC) – a committee that advises the Chancellor on health-related services. Ashe also incorporates student workers. Ashe no longer has a carryforward due to the pandemic. Ashe does not rely on SFAC for temporary funding. 25% of Ashe’s revenue comes for SSF funds. In terms of their work being affected by the pandemic, the answer is yes. In terms of supporting underserved students, Ashe talked a lot about equality and reaching out to more students. However, they did not take equity in mind and how some communities may be harder to reach than others. She shared that Ashe took the equality standpoint by saying that all students have a primary care provider and all have access to CAPS through tele health. In terms of centering underserved communities, she shared what Ashe wrote was weak – Ashe talked about extending deadlines and late fees. Ashe has data; however, they have not been analyzing it very well due to COVID.In terms of mental health needs that was fine. In terms of graduate students, Ashe is trying to bring testing to graduate students to increase accessibility. According to data, Ashe has high satisfaction rates. **Atreyi Mitra** shared that she is still struggling with what units portray on their unit review and that it may not be what the unit actually does. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** shared that her group had a similar conversation about not know exactly what units are doing just based on their unit review answers. She suggested having a more specific conversation with the unit.
		* **Atreyi Mitra** shared that the Bruin Resource Center (BRC) is an overarching unit with an overall goal to support student’s development wellbeing and academic success. The BRC tries to foster an inclusive and socially just campus climate. In terms of the BRC using SSF funds according to guidelines, yes. The BRC regularly meets with students and student orgs – students themselves made these evaluative assessments, which gave real work opportunities using peer led data collection. In terms of carryforward, they had over $500k because of vacant positions and donor fund grants. They hope to use this carryforward for student staff positions and programs. The BRC is affected by temp funding. They have a very specific action plan on what they are going to do to reduce expenditures, as well as look into donor funding. In relation to SFAC priorities, the BRC met the terms of underserved communities – they created a social justice committee where they are looking into how the BRC can structurally be more antiracist. They also have very intentional hiring when looking into communities that units aim to serve. The BRC met the fundamental mental health needs, providing a safe and healthy campus environment with community building events, financial support, 1:1 meetings and workshops. Graduate students were involved when getting money from UCOP for undocumented students and students with dependents task force. The BRC was also working with intentional outreach to graduate students. The only negative is that graduate students are still not using the BRC resources.
		* **Devanee Matcham** asked if Ashe had a confidential complaint form. **Christine Wilson** stated yes. **Laxman Dahal** asked for the total funding request from the BRC.
		* **Charles Turner** presented on Veteran Services and Community Programs Office (CPO). Their request was for a little under $13k. They want to use the funds to fund one fulltime equivalent position, who lead six staff and community building and connections to veteran students. The unit did a good job explaining how Veteran Services is another underserved group on campus. They have their own unique challenges – people have gone off to serve in the military and did not go to college right after high school. Many feel a sense of loss and that they do not have comraderies like they did in the military. They come to campus and do not know where to go or how to ask questions. Veteran Services helps create community through their operations. During the pandemic, student employees reach out to veterans via, Zoom, emails and phone calls. Veterans were able to connect with tutoring services, access to resources and help with connecting the dots for medical services and other off campus veteran services. They are leveraging the resources they are asking for and hitting a group that is under represented across campus. **Charles Turner** recommended yes for approval.
		* **Charles Turner** presented on the Community Programs Office (CPO). The unit is asking for $117k, which is broken down into three components - $85k for an administrative analyst for their salary and benefits, $25k to fund the CPO leadership externship fellowship – a fellowship or grant to fund five students, $7400 for one student project coordinator, who tutors specifically for math success programs. The math success program had data proving success and how they are helping students learn math online and showing that they have been using Zoom over the last year and how they have been effective getting math tutoring. A negative is that the CPO had very little data on their submission to support their claims. Charles Turner has asked the CPO to provide additional details to help support and validate to ensure they are matching what the committee’s requests are. The CPO leadership externship fellowship seemed like a good program to connect different groups that are challenged to get internships, however, not enough data was provided to validate its success. Regarding $85k for an administrative analyst salary – this person is in the building helping coordinate student employees. The position has been vacant but are looking to fill this position in hopes to leverage some of their other programs. They talked about how they help facilitate discussions between many groups, however, did not provide data. For the largest dollar amount requested, the CPO provided the least amount of support and the least amount of linkage to what SFAC goals and priorities are. **Samantha Solemnidad** asked if it would be possible to meet with the Student Initiated Center (SIC) and Campus Retention Center (CRC) Chairs to ask if they can share how the CPO uses funds received from them. **Ellen Hermann** shared that almost all units that receive SSF funds also have other funding resources. She shared that this is something to consider when looking into other funds and that most do not fall under SFAC purview – most would be general funds. **Christine Wilson** shared that referendum funds is a gray area. **Bradley Alvarado** shared that his problem with the CPO is that they are not transparent on how funds are allocated and they do not provide data. His concern is if SFAC give the CPO all this money, he is not confident that the unit will use the money for what they say they are going to use it for. He shared that student involvement is hard in the CPO, at least on the transfer side. He shared that he knows a lot of students, whose voices have been shut down, they have had no input in these spaces, which is important in decision making. The concerns with the CPO have been brought to administration many times and they continue to protect the CPO and do not hold them accountable for the funds they received. He shared that it tiring to see this continued trend with this unit. **Christine Wilson** asked if he would like to send additional questions regarding SFAC priorities regarding populations that are underserved and underrepresented and ask how are they are being inclusive relating to student voices from different areas. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** asked what the Veterans unit was doing with the SSF funds. **Charles Turner** shared that they asked for $50k but does not know all the other fund sources. However, their main goal is to provide a linkage between on campus and off campus groups.
		* **Paarth Shah** presented on Ombudsman. They are a small unit with only $200k and vast majority is permanent funding – 90% of funding is used for intake coordinator and office manager salaries, 75% off SSF funds is used for the Ombudsperson, and 3 ½ percent for a fulltime employee for a consult on staff. No significate carryforward, no revenue, no real loss. Ombudsman Office is a conflict resolution mediation option for academic situations that may arise with students, faculty and staff. They did not provide any student feedback mechanisms, alongside general lack of data and materials they provided. Another area of concern is that they are currently only serving about 225-300 students every year, which is 40% of their intake., 60% is none-related student support. The unit did an adequate job addressing the SFAC priorities. However, not enough data on outreach. Out of the 225-300 students that they serve, half are graduate students.
		* **Paarth Shah** presented on SOLE. They have $700k in permanent funding. This year they are requesting $21k in temp funding – split between undergraduate and graduate student staff. They use SFAC funding to fund most of their department’s absence. Take away is that the student org has increased significantly despite COVID affecting the university, which mean they are busy. They have almost a million dollars in carry forward, which goes towards salaries and short-term funding requests – ECRT, CPO Food Closet, BRC scholarships. Largely speaking, not enough transparency. If SFAC funds decrease, their one request is funding the student salaries and scholarships. Regarding SFAC priorities, they put together a social justice toolkit for student orgs.
		* **Paarth Shah** presented on UCLA Rec. Funding allocation about $1.7 million in perm, $70k is being requested in temp funding to primarily fund staff on the intermural fields on campus. 32% of UCLA Rec budget comes from perm funding. 23 fulltime employees are funded through SFAC funds. 80% of students use UCLA Rec at some capacity as a student. They have $400k in carryforward, which will be used to pay for students’ salaries once back on campus. They have an $8M dollar deficit this year. To recover this revenue, they plan on increasing sports fees, offer work spaces for rentals, event rentals, sponsorships and partnership opportunities. There is data that shows UCLA Rec is using their funding well. They worked closely with SAIRO to put together real assessments and advocacy of their services. Regarding Athletics, Athletics can choose to use their SSF funding to maintain UCLA Rec spaces, but there is no formal arrangement between Athletics and UCLA Rec.
5. **GSA Referendum Presentation -- JP Santos, GSA President**
	1. **Atreyi Mitra** opened the floor for JP Santos to present on GSA Referendum.
	2. JP Santos shared;
		* An explanation of budges sources
		* GSA Organizational Chart
		* Where does the GSA fee go to?
		* Current Budget Situations
		* Summary of budget changes
	3. GSA is composed of four Executive Officers:
		* President
		* Vice President
		* Vice President External
		* Vice President Academics
	4. Explanation of GSA Budget Sources
* GSA Membership Fee. This is their main source of income and amounts to most of the GSA budget. This is all of GSA operations including staff stipends, utilities, maintenance, etc.
* ASUCLA Interaction Fund. ASUCLA allocates some money to GSA to support specific line items. These funds must be spent on anything related to graduate events.
* Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC). These funds come from SFAC and are primarily delineated for GSA Publications and GSA Discretionary Funds.
	1. Where does the GSA fee go to?
* Local Council Fees ($5.50 per quarter)
	+ Councils use this to fund local events in their schools or departments and other advocacy campaigns
	+ Is managed by the four GSA officers
	+ Uses the funds to create programming, advocacy, and services for the whole graduate and professional student body
		- The goal of these events and services is to link the various councils and students together from diverse departments
* GSA Central Fees ($7.25 per quarter)
	1. Current Situation: Fees are not tied to inflation
* GSA fees are not tied to inflation. Spending power as GSA is decreasing.
	+ About $13k per year – the cost of a graduate event, two GSA directors who manage services, programming and advocacy on behalf of 13,000 graduate student body.
	+ This decrease severely affects their ability to serve GSA student body.
* Proposal:
	+ Raise the fees only of the central campus allocation to keep new students’ fees costs down.
	+ GSA is proposing on only increasing the fees to the GSA Central Office and tying that to inflation to prevent adverse effects on programming for all graduate and professional students.
	1. GSA Fee Referendum
* Should the GSA institute a new fee of $2.50 per quarter to restore the GSA Central Office fees to its level in the year 2000 and thereby support GSA programming, services and facilities? This fee shall thereafter be adjusted for inflationary increases annually beginning Fall 2021 based on the LA County Consumer Price index.
* Proposal:
	+ Beginning Fall 2021, a new fee is instituted that amounts to $2.50 per quarter.
	+ Beginning Fall 2022, this new fee will increase to $5.01 per quarter.
	1. GSA Proposal in using Fees
* If referendum passes, this will provide an additional $85k to the GSA Central Office.
	1. Explanation of Proposal
		+ Increase of events funding (appx. $42k of new cost)
		+ Increase of staff (appx. $21k of new cost)
		+ Increase of external advocacy (appx. $9k of new cost)
1. **Announcements**
	1. N/A

**Jackie Markt-Maloney** made a motion to adjourn the meeting and **Samantha Solemnidad**

seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:03pm.