**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting** **Room A-239, Murphy Hall 4:30-6:30pm Tuesday, October 22, 2019**

**Present:**

Graduates: Janay Williams

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

Administration: 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:**

Brittnee Meitzenheimer, Graduate Representative

Denise Marshall, Graduate Representative

Call to order at 4:41pm

**Call to Order**

1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** called the meeting to order at 4:33pm.
2. **Approval of the Agenda**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that she would like to add a consent item to the agenda so that the committee can consider a slight adjustment to the language to the amendment to the SFAC Charter that was approved last week. Specifically, the committee received feedback that the amendment should use “nominate” rather than “appoint” in the amendment language.
		1. **Karen Rowe** moved to add the consent item to the agenda. **Atreyi Mitra** seconded. With no objections, the consent item was added to the agenda.
	2. **Paulina Macias** asked to table the Discussion of Master Student Amendment to Charter until next week as several Graduate student representatives, including students in Masters degree programs, are absent and those students may have valuable input to provide.
		1. **Karen Rowe** moves to strike the Discussion of Master Student Amendment to Charter from this week’s agenda, **Paulina Macias** seconded. With no objections, the item was removed from the agenda.
	3. **Karen Rowe** moved to approve the agenda. **Kevin Kilgore** seconded. With no objections, the agenda without item " Discussion of Master Student Amendment to Charter” and with consent item “Discussion of Change in Terminology of Amendment to SFAC Charter” was approved by consent.
3. **Review of Handouts**
	1. **N/A**
4. **Approval of Minutes**
	1. **Kevin Kilgore** moved to approve minutes from 10.15.19. Atreyi Mitra seconded. With no objections, the minutes from 10.15.19 were approved.
5. **Approval of Unit Review Questions**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the floor to discuss Approval of Unit Review Questions**.** She said thatbecause both the SFAC funding requests and the Call Letter need to be reworked, it may be worth it for the committee to send the Unit Review separately from the Call Letter. This would give units additional time to consider their responses. The goal for today is to approve and finalize Unit Review questions. Next week, the committee will aim to finalize the cover letter.
		1. **Karen Rowe** reminded the group that the Unit Review should include a cover letter that would provide units with more context about the format of the Unit Review process.
		2. **Ellen Hermann** said that in the past, when the Unit Review and Call Letter have been sent separately, there have been discrepancies between the funding request information provided and the Unit Review information provided. It may make more sense to have the Unit Review and Call Letter responses due at the same time so that units can tie their responses to both together. The committee could also make it clear to units that the information that they provide in funding request forms should be supported by responses to unit review questions. If the committee requests that units do come to meetings to present, they should be careful about how they frame those requests. It may not be a good idea to come across as if the committee is selectively targeting or rewarding any particular unit with an opportunity to present.
	2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that if the committee choose to send both the Unit Review and Call Letter together, then the Call Letter needs to be sent a much sooner. However, it ultimately depends on when the committee wants items to be due. In the last meeting, the suggestion was to have items due after students return from Winter Break. If the committee decides to do that, it should be noted that they will not be able to review anything for the remainder of this quarter.
		1. **Christine Wilson** said that the January 10th deadline was based on the idea that the committee would not be bringing in any units or going out to visit units after that point. The remaining time would be spent reviewing unit responses.
	3. **Deb Geller** said that from the perspective of someone who has filled out these documents, filling them out together is less work than filling them out separately. Being able to cut and paste is helpful; not having to provide different answers to the same question is also helpful. She added that she does not believe any work is going to be done over winter break. She suggested that the deadline should be the last day of Finals week. With that deadline, the committee can have all of the responses compiled and ready to review by the time the committee reconvenes in January. Otherwise, the committee will not be able to start reviewing responses from units until late January. Even with last year’s earlier deadline (late November), the committee faced a significant challenge in trying to review and make recommendations by the end of the academic year.
	4. **Atreyi Mitra** asked to clarify and distinguish the difference between the Unit Review and Call Letter documents.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** stated that the Unit Review asks units questions about their services, data proving how services are utilized, and carryforward. The Unit Review asks units to tell the committee about themselves. The funding request includes the Call Letter and simply asks for units to submit their requests for funding (positions, programs, etc.) for the next two years. These typically come in the form of spreadsheets with line item requests and explanations of specific items. The funding requests asks units to tell the committee what they need.
	5. **Carina Salazar** asked if the Unit Review is requested for units that the committee has funded. Further, does that mean that those units necessarily submit funding requests as well.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that typically, all units who receives Student Services Funds (SSF) should complete a unit review, whether or not they are requesting funds.
		2. **Deb Geller** clarified that this includes all units who receive permanent and temporary funds from the prior year. Not all units receive temporary funds, but if they have a permanent budget, they still have to complete a Unit Review.
		3. **Christine Wilson** reminded the committee that most permanent allocation decisions were made quite a while ago and recent SFAC committees have not made decisions or recommendations about those specific funds.
	6. **Karen Rowe** said that there should be an explicit question about permanent funds either in the Unit Review or in the funding request questions. She added that she would like to know how permanent funds have been allocated in recent years, particularly because there has been carryforward from the permanent allocations. The committee needs a richer view to really examine the permanent budget.
	7. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee members to indicate whether or not they were in favor of sending both the Unit Review and Call Letter together. By a show of hands, all committee members present were in favor of sending both documents together.
	8. **Atreyi Mitra** asked **Deb Geller** to clarify what she meant earlier in the meeting when she indicated that there would be a short timespan if the deadline to submit Unit Review and Call Letter responses was pushed to December/January. She asked if the committee would have the same time constraints this year if they do not request all units to present.
		1. **Deb Geller** said that a significant amount of time went into subcommittees completing their initial review, followed by the entire committee reviewing items together. This year's committee should anticipate that there are going to be significantly more funding requests than the committee can fill; the difference between the requests and what the committee can fill will be greater this year than last year. Last year, after the first subcommittee review, the committee approved too much. This required the committee to start cutting funding “across the board” and the time constraint was such that the cuts did not happen in a thoughtful way. If the committee has to cut even more and the committee uses the same method of breaking out in subcommittees, there may be a situation in which individual subcommittees operate in different ways with different criteria. Then when the group reconvenes, the committee will need to do something to make subcommittee recommendations more equitable. The committee needs to have sufficient time to do this; we have found that year after year, discussions will take longer than what the committee expects. The earlier we start, the more comprehensive and thoughtful the committee can be as a full committee to make equitable and fiscally responsible decisions.
	9. **Carina Salazar** asked if it is necessary for the committee to break into subcommittees to review the information that units submit and make specific financial recommendations for funding. Instead, could the committee as a whole make recommendations for funding?
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that one benefit of subcommittee work is that it provides thorough review of unit applications and it allows subcommittees the opportunity to ask units follow up questions before the entire committee reconvenes. While subcommittees are helpful in thoroughly analyzing information and filling in gaps, they are not as helpful when subcommittees came up with specific numbers for funding recommendations.
		2. **Karen Rowe** said that when looking at an application from a unit, there is an immense amount of labor on some occasions that is best handled by a small group. In previous years, there was a lot of interaction between committee members and the units to ensure that the committee had a clear picture of what they were looking for. That process is less effectively done by a larger group.
		3. **Carina Salazar** agreed that it makes sense to utilize subcommittees to do this type of intensive labor work of unit research, but it may not make sense for subcommittees to make specific funding recommendations.
	10. **Nicole Corona Diaz** redirected the conversation and asked committee members to review Unit Review questions.
		1. **Karen Rowe** said that she would like to add a question to ask about permanent allocations and how those funds are currently being utilized. She suggested language to say, “Please map your permanent allocations and detail how they are being utilized.” She added that the committee needs a clear picture of total revenue sources.
			1. **Ellen Hermann** clarified that trend reports do breakdown permanent budgets, but permanent budgets aren’t necessarily allocated for specific line items.
			2. **Karen Rowe** asked if permanent budgets were often allocated for specific positions.
				1. **Ellen Hermann** said that in some cases this is the case, but not always.
			3. **Christine Wilson** added that there can be historical records of how permanent budgets were allocated to positions.
			4. **Karen Rowe** said that the committee still does not have a picture of how much of a permanent budget is being utilized. The committee just has a gross figure.
			5. **Deb Geller** clarified that the permanent budgets are allocated in “sub 1” for full-time staff, “sub 2” for part-time staff, and “sub 3” for a small amount to partially cover what is left. The committee could likely get access to the permanent budget reports if it was essential to see what percentage was permanently for staff. The specific positions are in the UC PATH system.
			6. **Ellen Herman** said that to a certain extent, some of the permanent budget can be moved around if a department chooses to move it during the middle of the year.
				1. **Deb Geller** said that you cannot create a “sub 1” unless you give up money for benefits. She added that many units do not have additional funding to give up.
			7. **Karen Rowe** said that it was surprising, for instance, to see $750K on Athletics budget suddenly allocated to medical insurance. She added that’s not something that SFAC would normally fund.
				1. **Ellen Hermann** said that this information will not show up on reports as they are designed now. She added that she is unclear as to how committee members might want to adjust these reports at this point, but she is open to creating reports with new suggestions.
			8. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked to clarify that if the committee comes up with what they would like to see in addition to current trend reports, that is something that **Ellen Hermann** would be open to exploring.
				1. **Ellen Hermann** said that if she can pull requested data from a financial statement or systems, it would be better for her to pull that information as opposed to having individual units pull this information on their own. This would avoid having units mistakenly leave out any relevant information.
			9. **Karen Rowe** said that the committee is asking units to explain changes and uses of temporary funding, but the committee just has no information and no idea how this permanent money is being spent. Unless the committee asks units directly, she is unsure how the committee would know this information.
				1. **Ellen Hermann** clarified that current trend reports do show this information and that if committee members have specific questions about this information, she can look up that information for any committee member that asks.
	11. **Nicole Corona Diaz** reminded the committee that one of the goals of today’s meeting is to get through Unit Review questions. She asked if any committee members wanted to make fundamental changes or addition to unit review questions.
		1. **Carina Salazar** said that the committee has thought through these questions in previous meetings and it appears as though the group needs to move on. It is important to get a sense of the committee’s approach to funding; we need to decide what our stance is as a SFAC committee. She added that it is critical that the committee asks thoughtful questions that help make informed decisions.
		2. **Deb Geller** asked about Unit Review question seven, “”– Specifically she was unsure if the question was asking about items that have already gotten a commitment for 21-22 or if it was asking about items that units are asking for in 21-22?
			1. **Ellen Hermann** suggested that this question may be more appropriately asked as a part of the Call Letter.
			2. **Deb Geller** agreed that this question seems to fit better in the Call Letter.
			3. **Ellen Hermann** suggested that question eight(8) may be more appropriately asked in the Call Letter as well because the lack of SFAC funding will not affect units unless they are requesting funding. Both question seven and eight seem to be tied to funding requests.
	12. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that she will resend these questions to the committee with suggestions and updates.
6. **Discussion of Change in Terminology of Amendment to SFAC Charter**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened the floor to discuss a change in terminology of the amendment to the SFAC Charter that was approved in last week’s meeting. Specifically, the committee received feedback that the amendment should use “nominate” rather than “appoint” in the amendment language.
	2. **Janay Williams** asked why the committee needed to change this language.
		1. **Kevin Kilgore** clarified that the Chancellor is the only person who can appoint a student to the committee and the SFAC committee only nominates students for the Chancellor to appoint.
	3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee if there was any opposition sending the Amendment language with the updates in terminology to the Chancellor. With no oppositions, **Nicole Corona Diaz** will move forward with submitting the updated amendment to the Chancellor.
	4. **Karen Rowe** clarified that when submitting letters to the Chancellor, it is best practice to submit a cover letter that uses language that does not contradict the actual amendment language. She asked to confirm that language in both the cover letter and amendment language are consistent.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** confirmed that those documents will be reviewing for congruency and clarity.
7. **Discussion on Call letter and timeline**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opened to the floor to discuss the Call Letter and timeline. Shereviewed funding cycles from previous SFAC committee recommendations.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that last year, the SFAC committee sent recommendations to the Chancellor for the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 academic years. $5,171,290 was recommended and approved for 2019-2020 and $3,919,488 was recommended approved for 2020-2021.
		2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** clarified that this year’s committee will make recommendations for 2020-2021 and 2021-2022. It is important to note that 2020-2021 is already partially funded because last year’s SFAC committee submitted recommendations for that year that were approved by the Chancellor.
		3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that two committees ago, the committee only recommended funding for a single year (2018-2019). Units did not have any basis for understanding funding for 2019-2020 year. As a result, there were an unusually high number of funding requests for 2019-2020 the next year because that year hadn’t been partially funded yet.
		4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that this year’s committee will revisit the 2020-2021 year that is partially funded in addition to 2021-2022. If units need to add anything for the 2020-2021 year, they can ask for additional funding beyond the partial funding that has already been approved.
	2. **Atreyi Mitra** said that there appears to be a significantly smaller amount of funding that this year’s committee has to work with. She asked if last year’s committee was aware of the impact that their partial funding decision would have on this year’s committee decisions.
		1. **Ellen Hermann** reminded the committee that there is a level of uncertainty in funding amounts. There could have been a change in funding after last year’s committee made their decision that would have alleviated the budgeting challenges. For instance, SSF amounts could have increased.
		2. **Karen Rowe** said that the ask for 2020-2021 was quite high and almost double of what the committee was actually able to fund. Those asks are not feasible; if last year’s committee had funded 2020-2021 in the same way that they funded the 2019-2020 year, there would have been nothing for this year’s committee to work with.
		3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that the spreadsheet of the recommendations for the 2020-2021 year contains several $0 amounts. That is why there was such a drastic change from the recommendations between the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 years. The committee simply ran out of money and had they matched the recommendation amounts for both years, this year’s committee would not have any funds to recommend.
	3. **Ellen Hermann** said that while the committee can recommend on any years that they want, continuing to recommend in two-year cycles makes sense. She added that she would recommend, and she has received feedback that Student Affairs also thinks that this may be a good idea, that the committee does not plan on additional funding for 2020-2021 and adds language in the Call Letter to clarify this. The language could say, “You may submit requests, but we do not anticipate providing any funding.” If the committee sees any extraordinary cases that they would like to fund, they can recommend funding for them, but adding specific language to let units know that you’re focusing on the following year will be helpful.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that last year, the committee did not include this language because the previous committee only recommended for one year, so that is why they had a large number of requests. This year’s committee could decide to include this additional language in the Call Letter or not.
		2. **Ellen Hermann** clarified that her recommendation is not to say that the committee will not fund any requests for 2020-2021, but rather that they do not anticipate funding any requests for that year. They committee can allow units to request funds for 2020-2021 so that they are not excluded from requesting it; there may be cases in which a previous committee provided funding for a project for a single year for a particular reason, even though the committee believes in the project so much so that they would like to fund a second year. That said, it is important to let units know that this year’s committee will not be funding much from 2020-2021. Language could also say that the committee will consider requests for that year only under extraordinary circumstances.
	4. **Christine Wilson** recommend that the committee thinks creatively about this. It seems at thought last year, by the end of the year, the committee had to make several last-minute, broad cuts in funding. We’ve heard arguments for no more funding recommendations for 2020-2021. However, we have also heard arguments from campus partners at SFAC Orientation who said that at times, these broad cuts may not have made sense. For example, there were cuts to positions, but no cuts to the programs that they were associated with. Or, there were cuts to programs, but not the people that went with them. It doesn’t match up. Rather than increasing their funding, this committee could give units an opportunity to rebalance their budgets in a way that makes more sense for the work that they are doing.
		1. **Karen Rowe** said that the example that **Christine Wilson** brought up is why she believes that the committee needs clearer information.
		2. **Ellen Hermann** said that the level of detail that the SFAC committee currently has is very detailed; in fact, it may be the case that the committee does not even need the level of detail that it already has. If the committee views a program holistically, it says that there is a specific amount of funding that they want to provide for a program. Then, that program can decide how they want to divide up those funds and use them; the program does not necessarily need the committee to tell them exactly how to spend every last dollar. The units will find a way to run their own programs given the funds that they are allocated.
		3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that the committee needs to ask units to clarify which staff members were linked to what programs. In some cases, it is easy to tell, but in others, it can be very difficult. Without any clear link between staff and programs, it made the process of cutting funding across the board difficult. That is why the committee heard stories like the example that **Christine Wilson** provided at SFAC Orientation. She added that she is hopeful that the committee can avoid this situation this year, but that means that the committee needs to be clearer in the Call Letter about what they expect.
	5. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked to revisit the idea of giving units the flexibility to decide how they are going to spend SFAC funds. For example, if the committee has $2 million to recommend, it does not make sense to give each unit the same exact portion of that $2 million. So, it places the committee in a situation where they need to be careful to decide how specifically they are going to talk about funding each unit. The committee needs to decide if they want to give units the option to figure out the best use for limited funding that they are allocated. In this situation, they committee could still give specific parameters to ensure that units don not spend funds on something that was never presented to the SFAC committee. If the committee does not give units this degree of flexibility, units may be committed to fund a program, but may not necessarily have the personnel to run that program.
		1. **Janay Williams** said that given units run into these situations (when they might have funding to run a program, but no funding for a position to run the program), the committee should consider asking additional questions ahead of time. For example, the committee could ask specifically, “Who is going to run this program? How is that person going to act?” She added that she does not think the committee should be funding programs that cannot happen because there is no one in place to make them happen. Nor does she believe that the committee should be funding people who do not have programs to run.
		2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that the committee could add questions like this. The question could say something along the lines of, “If we do cut funding for the program, but provide funding for a position, what will that person be assigned to do?” There are a lot of variables in this situation (e.g. if the position has been filled or not), but that could be something that the committee explores.
		3. **Janay Williams** asked that if the committee has $1.5-2 million to allocate this year, is that funding going to go towards 2020-2021 and 2021-2022, or is this funding only going towards 2020-2021.
			1. **Ellen Hermann** said that based on what she had pulled in the budget model, it depends on which year the committee decides to put all of the funding in. She recommends putting all funding in 2021-2022, but the funding could be applied to both 2020-2021 and 2021-2022. Further, if the committee allocates more in the earlier years, it must tend on the lower side, but if the committee allocates more in the later years, it can tend towards the higher end of $2 million.
		4. **Atreyi Mitra** asked why is there a range for how much funding the committee can recommend this year.
			1. **Ellen Hermann** said that the way that permanent budgets works, every year the budget will get additional $1.2 million in funds. The longer the funds sit and the longer you wait, the more money you have pile on because every July 1, more money will hit.
			2. **Atreyi Mitra** asked to clarify if she understood what **Ellen Hermann** said correctly: that if it’s earlier, you have less money versus if it’s later, you have more money?
			3. **Ellen Hermann** said that basically because it is similar to the way that you get a paycheck each month. Say you receive $5,000 each month, but this month you’d like to spend $10,000. If you did that, you would be in deficit. The longer you wait, the more of a reserve you build up.
			4. **Janay Williams** asked **Ellen Hermann** if she believes that it makes sense to send out request for 2020-2021 at all then.
				1. **Ellen Hermann** said that the committee can, but it needs to be clear with the language and warn them about limitations in funding. There might be cases where the committee might strongly support something, but for whatever reason, on some technicality, they only fund that thing for one year and will consider funding again the following year. There may also be some sort of unexpected emergency situation that arises that requires 2020-2021 funding.
				2. **Karen Rowe** said that part of what the committee received late last year came in from the Student Affairs office. It helped us to some degree with budgeting by removing items as requests. That was self-determined and self-generated. There is a way that the committee should not be encouraging units to put these requests back on and there should be very strict funding.
				3. **Ellen Hermann** suggested saying “We're not planning on funding for the year, but if there are extraordinary requests you may request it.” She added that she understands that it is the committee’s decision, but she feels that the administration and the APB office feel this would be the best way to go about it.
	6. **Deb Geller** asked **Ellen Hermann** if the $1.5- 2 million include merit and benefits.
		1. **Ellen Hermann** clarified that it assumes the merits and benefits for all the outyears. Only two so far have been committed. She left them all in because there is so much variation.
		2. **Deb Geller** clarified that leaving merit and benefits in, there is still $1.5 million-$2 million. Typically, this committee has looked at all requests and tried to give everyone some portion rather than making difficult decisions about potentially cutting funding for programs that might not be effective any longer. She believes the committee should be open to the idea that the committee may need to prioritize certain items instead of giving all units less funding than they need to be effective.
			1. **Deb Geller** added that she is concerned about questions of utilization. She would rather the committee focus on the effectiveness and the outcomes rather than just the numbers. One example would be in the case of the Scholarship Resource Center. While a significant number of students visit the center and use its resources, a very small number of students receive scholarships that make a significant difference in their ability to stay in school. When the committee asks data-based questions about utilization, they are leaving out important aspects that capture if they are actually effective and achieve their learning outcomes. The committee could consider making some of those tough decisions like in the case of those programs that are requesting temporary funds year after year, to actually look at which are the top programs that make a difference for students, that aren’t duplicated in other places, and that need to be funded as close to fully as possible.
		3. **Karen Rowe** said that this is why the committee needs to utilize subcommittees because she was not in agreement with **Deb Geller’s** assessment. While outcomes are important, members of the committee may still disagree.
		4. **Janay Williams** said that she agrees with **Deb Geller** that outcomes are important. She added that the committee has discussed the importance of outcomes. She said that having surveys from students, student assessment, and data about what students are getting out of a program is really important. That will make committee members’ jobs easier.
	7. **Carina Salazar** asked if the committee would be accepting requests to adjust approved funding from units who are already receiving funding for 2020-2021.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that she believes the committee could accept requests to adjust approved funding.
		2. **Ellen Hermann** said that in theory, the committee can recommend anything that they feel is appropriate. Most organizations that will have issues like **Carina Salazar** mentioned will be able to figure it out for at least a year. If units keep coming back to the committee and say that they really cannot make their programs work, then it might be something to reconsider. It may be challenging if a committee had already approved funding for something to then come back and take that funding back the following year. She said that she does not recommend going down that road and opening that up.
	8. **Christine Wilson** asked when **Ellen Hermann** says “they’ll figure it out,” does she mean that they will adjust their funding on their own. There are some units do that quite a bit and others stick strictly to original funding uses.
		1. **Ellen Hermann** said that if the committee starts to hear that there are certain programs that absolutely cannot make their funding work as allocated, it may be worth considering. From what she has seen, on a one-year basis, most programs have been able to figure something out. For example, maybe the program does not provide as much as it used to, but they make it work for the year. Other committee members who have worked in these departments might have a better sense, but it seems tricky to recommend funding and then take it away.
		2. **Christine Wilson** clarified that she was not talking about taking funding away. She explained an example in which she submitted requests for four programs, but only a piece of each was funded. She would rather have two fully funded programs than four that don’t really work.
		3. **Ellen Hermann** said that she was unsure how the committee might go about recommending that scenario to the Chancellor. Moving forward, it’s a great idea. However, going backwards, it is more challenging.
	9. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that recommendations that the committee makes can be anything. If in the Unit Review the committee can include something along the lines of, “Based on the funding that you were provided, are there any programs that you feel you cannot continue?” We would want to better understand how funding affected a unit. The committee needs to do a lot of work in figuring out what needs to be cut based on student needs and the outcomes. She added that she thinks that is very important that they figure out what it is that this committee wants to do as a committee. That will influence Call Letter language. The committee needs to include a question linking people to programs so that they are aware and avoid cuts that do not make sense for programs to function.
		1. **Karen Rowe** said that part of the issue that this is the first year when the committee may lay out in the Call Letter that the funding available through temporary funds are 50% of what was available in 2020-2021. Most departments are operating on 2019-2020 funds. The committee needs to get units to report on what their anticipated strategies are for 2021 and to think forward to what happens when their funding lessens in 2021-2022. The committee can ask units what they envision when funding halves and then halves again.
		2. **Deb Geller** suggested that there may be value in reattaching 2020-2021 awards to the Call Letter. She suggested saying, “We previously announced the awards for 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. The funding for 2020-2021 is approximately 80% of the funding for 2019-2020. The funding available for 2021-2022 is projected to be approximately 40% of funding for 2019-2020. Here is what has already been approved for your unit for 2020-2021. Please use this as a starting point in preparing your request for the 2021-2022 year. We don’t anticipate adding any additional funding for 2020-2021. In extraordinary circumstances, you may make a request, but they are not likely to be funded given the limited funds.” The committee could provide more details about 2020-2021 numbers as a starting point. If their minds, it is the current year, it may be challenging for units to understand that they are not going down by $2 million, they are going down by $3 million.
		3. **Karen Rowe** said that the committee needs to be clear in the Call Letter that they have no ability to project that there will be additional funding state-wide or any SSF adjustments. The committee has to be brutally honest that it does not look like there will be agreement on increases to student fees.
	10. **Janay Williams** said that difference between 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 funding was only ~$1.1 million. Since this year’s committee only has a maximum $2 million to recommend this year, they should focus on funding for 2021-2022.
	11. **Atreyi Mitra** said that she likes **Ellen Hermann’s** suggestions for verbiage to add to the Call Letter. It leaves things open for units, but also conveys that it is highly unlikely that the committee will recommend additional funding for 2020-2021.
		1. **Paulina Macias** said that she also agrees with the language that **Ellen Hermann** suggested; she said that it is important to not close off requests for funding for 2020-2021, but it is also important to be clear about the funding limitations.
		2. **Ellen Hermann** said that she liked the way that **Deb Geller** phrased suggested language to add to the Call Letter.
	12. **Karen Rowe** said the committee should be upfront in asking what the units’ top priorities are. While some units may choose not to list priorities or list several items as top priorities, it is helpful to hear priorities directly from the units, and it allows the committee to honor their planning processes.
	13. **Carina Salazar** said that she is okay with making difficult decisions. She said that she prefers that the committee provides as much clarity as possible for units in the Call Let; that way, if the committee is clear from the start, units will not necessarily feel as bad or surprised about lack of recommended funding this year.
	14. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that the committee will have to make difficult decisions; even then, the committee might not be able to fund everyone’s top priorities.
	15. **Karen Rowe** said that the other aspect of the committee's discussions that she would like to see is where can the committee begin to think through what should be recuperated or are there places where the funding has been allocated not according to guidelines that are set forward for which programs and entities should be funded. She added that it is important that the committee things about how they can take cognizance of the fact that, for instance, some units may be doing academic support work (and we’re not supposed to be funding strictly academic, like Faculty or academic program functions). Should those items then be a part of another entity's responsibility (academic, alumni, etc.)?
		1. **Carina Salazar** asked if those questions are a part of SFAC’s responsibilities. Is it outside of the committee’s lane to be asking that?
		2. **Christine Wilson** said that historically, at least going back to 1993, SFAC has several times looked at whether or not an office does what it originally received 20,000 money for. There were times that it was the case that they were not doing that anymore. For example, if a unit used to do a specific function, but they no longer do that anymore. However, the time when the committee should consider doing that is when you have to start making very aggressive cuts to the budget. This year, it does not seem like we’re at the point where we have to do that. There may be a few specific units that you are wondering about and in those situations, you may want to bring them in to speak with the committee.
		3. **Karen Rowe** said that she wanted to ask about the fact that SFAC funds Office of Technology to fund computers and updates for all student affairs entities. Is that an infrastructure that is essential for any modern university and, ergo, is that appropriate use of SFAC funds?
			1. **Ellen Hermann** said that while the SFAC committee can make those decisions, the example that **Karen Rowe** brought up is explicitly called out as an appropriate use in the guidelines.
			2. **Karen Rowe** asked to clarify and confirm that this was indeed an appropriate use of funding.
			3. **Ellen Hermann** said that yes, things like the Technology Infrastructure Fee (TIF) were things she believed were called out specifically in the guidelines.
			4. **Karen Rowe** asked if the guidelines do consider building infrastructure as appropriate use of SFAC funding? These are the types of things that she believes the SFAC committee should review in the guidelines and rethink what SSF should be used for.
	16. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that she has a good perspective to draft letter for committee. She asked the committee to consider the timeline to send out the Call Letter and Unit Review together. She reminded the group that they had talked about a possible due date at the end of week one of Winter quarter. She added that earlier in this week’s meeting, **Deb Geller** brought up the idea of setting the due date at the end of Finals week (December). She added that **Christine Wilson** brought up a valid point that just because the end of Finals week is when students finish classes, it does not necessarily mean that is when everyone (including staff) leave campus.
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee how much time they believe units need to fill out these forms?
			1. **Carina Salazar** said that she agrees with **Deb Geller** that December 13th is an appropriate deadline. It allows units to hold themselves accountable and take time off during the winter break as well.
			2. **Christine Wilson** said that if the committee sets a deadline of December 13th, it means that units will have to finish by December 6th because units have to submit their requests to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (VCSA) office one week before the deadline that the committee sets.
			3. **Deb Geller** said that she does not think a December 20th deadline is a good idea because it takes time for staff to put all of these responses together and organize them.
			4. **Ellen Hermann** said that if the due date is December 16th, then the committee can have responses compiled by the end of that week.
		2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said to clarify, the new proposed deadline is December 16th. She asked the committee to consider this deadline and asked if there were any objections. There were no objections to the deadline of December 16th.
		3. **Deb Geller** asked if it was possible for the committee to send out the Call Letter and the Unit Review by November 4th because committee will send the Call Letter and Unit Review to the VCSA office first. It will then take a week for these to get to the units.
			1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** suggested November 6th as a date to submit the Call Letter and Unit Review with the expectation is that she will send document drafts to committee members and that committee members review before next week’s meeting.
		4. **Karen Rowe** motioned to solidify the timeline of sending out the Call Letter and Unit Review documents out on November 6th with a due date of December 16th, **Paulina Macias** seconded. With no objections the timeline was confirmed.
	17. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asked the committee if there are any other items that anyone wants or does not want to see in the draft of the Call Letter.
		1. **Janay Williams** reiterated that she wants to know if a staff member or position connected to SFAC funding is connected to a program that also receives SFAC funding.
			1. **Karen Rowe** asked if that type of question belongs in the funding request questions.
			2. **Janay Williams** clarified that she was under the impression that the funding request questions were attached to the Call Letter.
			3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** clarified that they were discussing the Call Letter.
			4. **Ellen Hermann** said that it seems like there is confusion as to whether or not the committee is discussing the Call Letter or the questions that are attached to the Call Letter.
		2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** suggested that the committee discuss the Call Letter first, then get to the attached questions if time permits.
		3. **Janay Williams** said that she thinks it is important that the committee conveys that they do not have much funding to work with this year.
			1. **Ellen Hermann** recommended adding a specific range/number to help units adjust their expectations.
			2. **Deb Geller** suggested saying, “We anticipate being able to award not more than $2 million for the 2021-2022 year. We do not anticipate being able to make any additional awards for the 2020-2021 year, although you may submit requests if you have exceptional or extraordinary circumstances.”
			3. **Christine Wilson** said that typically when budget cuts are made, units are assigned a percentage and are told to cut. By providing this information, the committee is essentially providing them with the information that they need to control their own destiny. It also helps prevent what happened to them in previous years from happening again in future years. You may also want to include a warning that says: heed this or the committee will have to guess where to cut. It makes sense to do it that way because the committee does not want to get into the business of deciding where you’re going to cut somebody’s budget. Let them decide by making appropriate requests.
			4. **Deb Geller** said that she suggested providing units with a specific number of what has already been approved for the current year and 2020-2021 for this reason. Giving units numbers for current year and 2020-2021 approvals helps them understand the upcoming cuts. It helps them connect that $2 million is less than $4 million and that the funding amounts are really shrinking.
			5. **Karen Rowe** suggested clarifying that the amount this year’s committee has to allocate is 40% of what was approved for 2020-2021.
	18. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that she will send a copy of questions that are attached to Call Letter to committee members. She asked that committee members send revisions and questions ahead of next week’s meeting.
	19. **Ellen Hermann** asked if the committee has discussed the form and if so, if they want to make changes to the form?
		1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** said that the committee has briefly reviewed the funding categories, but they can discuss it in greater detail next week.
		2. **Christine Wilson** asked if this was in Box and requested that it is sent out to the committee members again.
	20. **Karen Rowe** asked to reinclude a box that asks for all revenue sources and amounts that a unit receives in the funding requests. She added that it was standard feature for a number of years.
8. **Discussion of Master Student Amendment to Charter**
	1. **N/A**
9. **Announcements**
	1. **N/A**
10. **Adjournment**
	1. **Kevin Kilgore** moved to adjourn the meeting**. Atreyi Mitra** seconded. With no objections, **Nicole Corona Diaz** adjourned the meeting at 6:30 pm.