**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

**Room 2206, Murphy Hall**

**4:30-6:30pm Tuesday, November 26, 2019**

**Attendees:**

Graduates: **Janay Williams, Brittnee Meitzenheimer, Jackie Markt-Maloney**

Undergraduates: **Nicole Corona Diaz, Atreyi Mitra, Paulina Macias**

Administration: **Carina Salazar,** **Deb Geller**

Faculty Rep: **Karen Rowe**

SFAC Advisor: **Christine Wilson**

APB Advisor: **Ellen Hermann**

Absent: **Denise Marshall, Kevin Kilgore, Karen KP Patron**

**Nicole Corona Diaz** calls the meeting to order at 4:40 PM.

1. **Approval of the agenda** 
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** suggest tabling agenda item 6 “Discussion of Conflict of Interest Bylaws” for next week and add “Discussion about Winter Quarter meeting time” and “Discussion about Subcommittee Review Process.”
   2. **Atreyi Mitra** motions to approve agenda and **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** seconds this motion.
2. **Review of Handouts**
   1. “Master Student Amendment Language”
3. **Approval of Minutes**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** mentions a discrepancy in the 11/19/19 minutes. She ask the group if they can remember who seconded **Atreyi Mitra’s** and **Jackie** **Market-Maloney’s** appointment. The group decides **Karen KP Patron** seconded that appointment in the last meeting.
   2. **Deb Geller** motions to approve the minutes and **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** seconds the motion.
4. **Approval of Master Student Amendment** 
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** says that she would be adding new sections, B and C, to the amendment. She gives the group a few minutes to read over the updates.
   2. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** ask for clarification on section B of Master Student Plan. **Nicole Cornoa Diaz** makes changes based on **Brittnee Meitzenheimer’s** suggestion.
   3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** says she will read the transfer student amendment side by side with this and then the committee can decide if we missed anything.
   4. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** believes there a redundancy in the language and that we should simply copy undergraduate transfer student amendment and change it to graduate student.
   5. *The committee collectively makes grammatical and clerical corrections*
   6. **Deb Geller** moves and **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** seconds to approve Masters Student Amendment to charter as written it with no objections.
      1. ***Master Student Amendment APPROVED***
   7. **Karen Rowe** recalls the amendment being amended last year due to the phasing changes around “Student Fee”. She asks **Nicole Corona Diaz** if someone has gone back to the minutes to see what was approved and sent by **Ellen Hermann**.
   8. **Ellen Hermann** says the amendment is based on the most current version of the charter. She believes the most current one has all the pronoun changes but that doesn’t mean it doesn’t need to be reviewed for corrections.
   9. **Nicole Corona Diaz** says she created the Master Student Amendment language from the most up to date version of the transfer student amendment that the Chancellor signed off on.
5. **Discussion of Letter to Chancellor**
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** says she mentioned the possibility of writing a letter to the Chancellor conceding last year’s recommendation. The committee last year came to the consensus that giving units some flexibility to line items to rework money they have already been approved for. Units would have fewer programs but more effective programs. **Nicole Corona Diaz** mentions if given this flexibility that SFAC may not have the time to hold them accountable.
   2. **Karen Rowe** recalls last week that the committee found it difficult to come to a conclusion. She suggest that SFAC should find a way to communicate to units that if they are going to incur a problem in the immediate year the unit should come to the committee to say they would like a variance. Instead of the committee trying to create the framework it would be a better idea to have units initiate.
   3. **Deb Geller** thinks Directors will find it more challenging to make do in the 2021 year than years 2019 and 2020. The committee did a better job holistically funding programs in 2019 and 2020 but in 2021 SFAC funded staff sometimes not even at their full FTE with no support for the programs that they're intended to run. **Deb Geller** says verbatim “I'd like to suggest we not offer this flexibility for the year that's half done, but rather we propose that for the 2021 year. If we funded staff to run a program, and denied the requested funding for the programmatic expenses themselves, that the entity be empowered to redistribute some of the allocated funds, so that they can make the programs happen.”
   4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** agrees it may be better to start the relocation of funds in 2021 rather than 2019. She questions if there a reason we would wait to send it out in the spring rather than sending out now. She says getting the Chancellor’s approval will be a timely process and asks if the committee would like to draft language and send this sooner or later.
   5. **Christine Wilson** recalls scenarios where program administrators will reach out to her to explain they have funding for X amount of graduate students and minimal funding for their program. In these scenarios the administrator doesn’t need funding for this many graduate students and would like to reallocate money toward the program.
   6. **Karen Rowe** responds to **Christine Wilson** saying the funding were set priorities by the program proposal itself. When programs are putting forth their proposals these needs should be built into the proposals. We would have a much better picture of the needs if we waited until 2021 to allow this flexibility. She says it will get really complicated if we are getting new proposals and units want to make changes to funding already allocated.
   7. **Nicole** **Corona Diaz** says programs are already redistributing funding without permission. This amendment would give program administrators the comfort knowing that they have both the Chancellor's and SFAC’s recommendation to do so. **Nicole** **Corona Diaz** lays out options of doing nothing or drafting language up for all years or just 2021. This discussion will give her the insight on how she should proceed.
   8. **Ellen Hermann** mentions her office would recommend not spending money just for the sake of possibly receiving less the next year. **Jackie Market-Maloney** agrees that programs will likely receive less money the next year but encourages them that to use the money they received the following year to carry forward.
   9. **Christine Wilson** says when drafting a proposal its priorities are set from most important to least.
   10. **Nicole Corona Diaz** reiterates it is not something we have to do. She gives the possible options to move forward.
   11. **Carina Salazar** asks if this were to take place in 2019 or 2020 when would we be able to give units answers and how soon would it be implemented?
   12. **Nicole Corona Diaz** explains the process of how it works. She says “it might still take a while because I'd have to draft the letter to the chancellor, show it to you all, then send it, then get the Chancellor’s response, then send it to the units and let them know what his response is.”
   13. **Deb Geller** opposes doing anything for the 2019 year because we are already far enough into the year and they are already working on the next year’s budget. She likes the idea of getting approval from the Chancellor now to offer that flexibility in 2021. As of now, we don’t know who is going to request additional funding for 20-21. She wouldn’t vote no but she will not support changing fund for 2019. She says the funding was generous and in the coming years there will be less funding and that’s where the flexibility will be needed most.
   14. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asks what the group thinks about drafting language for the 2020- 2021 year and sending it the Chancellor.
   15. **Karen Rowe** agrees with **Deb Geller**. The year 2019 was funded 5 million unfortunate contingencies of shrinking budgets in 2021 is where flexibility will be essential.
   16. **Jackie Market-Maloney** supports the idea of allowing flexibility in years 2020-2021. Taking from the staff budget to add to the program budget should always be allowed but she wants there to be language to prevent programs from spending on anything and setting up clear limitations. She asks if instead of creating framework, we allow unit reach out with and pressing funding concerns is an option the committee would consider. She also brings up the point that fees that masters students have already paid for may not get used on them and if it’s possible that flexibility could be made available now to ensure they are able to have access to units they paid for.
   17. **Christine Wilson** says when across the board cuts are made there are some programs will not happen. She thinks some programs will not be able to run just because they can’t move funding from one-line item to another. When a program has 60k to hire students and 10k to run a program that is poor planning on the committee.
   18. **Janay Williams** says she doesn’t mind programs moving money around if it’s for the benefit the students.
   19. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** says the committee didn’t necessarily make poor planning decisions but more so the information given to them wasn’t accurate enough to help them serve the students. She thinks the best way forward to find a solution to try to remedy that. She believes the students are ultimately the ones impacted be the decisions and she feels anything that can be done to increase services to students is ideal.
   20. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** says it wasn’t in her understanding that the amendment was ever going to allow units to fund something new out of the line items and more so to reallocate partial funding in one category to add to another line item that was essential to the function of the program.
   21. **Karen Rowe** says programs need to be aware that they should provide us with guidance that if there should be a shortage on funding, how should the committee allocate funds. Various kinds of rentals and expensive honorariums have been limited. SFAC shouldn’t make any changes until 2021 because this allows us time to get feedback and adjust accordingly.
   22. **Ellen Hermann** thinks the committee should think about how they will approach requests for this year and for two years out, because you don't want to have the same thing going on for the next three years. **Ellen Hermann** recommends when you see a request and it breaks out five line items, look at those all five together and think about whether or not you want to fund the program.
   23. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** says we shouldn’t be making one size fits all cuts because each program has different needs. We should be making programs whole so that we have end to end services.
   24. **Nicole Corona Diaz** ask group if she should draft this letter and if so for what years?
       1. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** says yes, we should bring up the letter and for all years.
       2. **Carina Salazar** agrees with **Brittnee Meitzenheimer,** butshe is concerned for this year because she doesn’t want a repeat and she want there to be options.
       3. **Deb Geller** is not confident that all partially funded programs are acting in good faith. She doubts that they have exhausted all solutions to make the program work and she cautions that granting flexibility with funding at this point set a precedent and expectation that we will fund whatever you want. “We would like to encourage units to collaborate with other units or find alternative methods of funding” however we will authorize them reallocate their staff funding to the program if necessary.
       4. **Christine Wilson** says the issue isn’t necessarily funding, the issue is not being able use the money in ways that benefit students.
       5. **Karen Rowe** - agrees with much of what **Deb Geller** said. She thinks there is nothing more we can do for the programs now and next year, as far as funding goes, we will be doing less.
       6. **Atreyi Mitra c**ommented to not make changes for 2019-2020. She spoke with a colleague who was in the November Regents meeting with UCOP and students suggested not increasing the SSF because it would increase overall tuition. Therefore, she stated that SFAC should not expect to have an increase in funding unless **Ellen Hermann** knows differently. She also mentioned her another committee she sits on in the Academic Senate that mentioned a cohort model based tuition in which there may be an increase in tuition in 2020-2021.
       7. **Ellen Hermann** encouraged the committee to invite the CFO, Gregg Goldman and AVC Jeff Roth to SFAC to share more information.
       8. **Janay Williams,** **Paulina Macias, and** **Nicole Corona Diaz** all think they should provide guidance for both years 2019-2021.
          1. **Jackie Market-Maloney** doesn’t think SFAC should give them flexibility unless it is in the specific instance they want to take money from staff to fund program both years (2019-2021).
          2. **Ellen Hermann** doesn’t think SFAC should have programs send them more things to review. She thinks this will slow down the process.
       9. **Nicole Corona Diaz** says based on the commentary she will draft language for years 2019-2021. The committee can expect the draft next week, where they will work on it together as a group.
6. **Discussion about Winter Quarter meeting time** 
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** asks the committee if the current meeting time works for the Winter Quarter.
   2. **Nicole Corona Diaz** concludes asking for availability and decides to instead send out this question via email and by next week she plans to have more insight from the people who were not at this meeting.
7. **Discussion about Subcommittee Review Process** 
   1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** describes how subcommittees worked in the previous years and question how would everyone like to move forward.
   2. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** thinks it would be a good idea for everyone to talk to together. If subcommittees were less effective, not in the work they did, but in the over commitment of funds. She says this is likely the reason subcommittees used up so much time. Since there are many people on the board that were here last year then the process should move faster.
   3. **Paulina Macias** is not opposed to subcommittees, she says things fell apart last year because some subcommittees members were missing and it delays the process but if we started talking about funding earlier it would alleviate this issue.
   4. **Janay Williams** thinks subcommittees are good but they tend to over allocate funds. She proposes a solution where subcommittees gather information and all together we make a decision on funding.
   5. **Carina Salazar** believes subcommittees work well and it ensure there’s consistency. If there will not be subcommittees she agrees with **Janay Williams’** idea.
   6. **Deb Geller** says the model that was used last year, the subcommittees had too much influence on funding, because the subcommittees approached things a little different it wasn’t equitable and consistent across the board. She then pitches the idea of working in groups but not making recommendations on numbers. She says it’s the best chance at being consistent and equitable.
   7. **Ellen Hermann** recommends the committee look at the Bylaws regarding subcommittees. She says whether or not the committee works in subcommittees, there needs to be someone responsible for reading and has all the details for each unit.
   8. **Karen Rowe** thinks there is value in the subcommittees doing the leg work. She asks if it possible we can dedicate some of the sessions to have the subcommittees meet. 3 presentations and 10-15 mins of questions took up most of the time during the sessions. She thinks there is value in having a smaller group to self-educate and having members ask question.
   9. **Nicole Corona Diaz** summarizes the groups ideals. She also mentions we can do it in way that everyone has certain things they are responsible for.
   10. **Jackie Market-Maloney** says she would definitely like for there to be subcommittees.
   11. **Janay Williams** likes **Debs Geller’s** idea and thinks everyone should work on one specific topic and meeting outside of already scheduled meeting would be difficult for her.
   12. **Carina Salazar** thinks subcommittees are a good idea and there is different backgrounds to share with more perspectives to get a more holistic viewpoint.
8. **Announcements**
   1. No announcements
9. **Adjournment**
   1. **Ateryi Mitra** motions **Paulina Macias** seconds to adjourn the meeting at 6:30pm.