**Student Fee Advisory Committee**

**1:00-3:00pm**

**Friday, December 4, 2020**

**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**

**Atreyi Mitra** called the meeting to order at 1:03pm.

1. **Community Sharing – Something that excites you about the winter holiday**
	1. **Atreyi Mitra** opened the floor for the committee to share something that excites them about the winter holiday.
2. **Approval of Agenda for Week 9**
	1. **Devanee Matcham** motioned and **Paarth Shah** seconded to approve the agenda. The agenda was approved unanimously.
3. **Approval of Minutes for Fall 2020 Week 6 (11/13/20)**
	1. **Gaby Barrios** motioned and **Laxman Dahal** seconded to approve Week 6 (11/13/20) minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously.
4. **Presentation by Ellen Hermann on Benefits Shortfall Scenarios**
	1. **Atreyi Mitra** opened the floor for Ellen Hermann to discuss the benefits shortfall.
	2. **Ellen Herman** shared the following:
		* Discussed how Student Affairs typically requests perm merit and benefits shortfall funding on behalf of all SSF-funded units.
		* Explained that this typically happens on a 2-year cycle, with permanent funding approved for two years at a time. SFAC already recommended and the Chancellor already approved perm funding for merits and benefits shortfalls this year (2020-21). However, this year most staff will not be receiving merit funding, only represented (union) staff will have increases. There will likely still be a need for benefits shortfall funding.
		* Explained that the benefits shortfall varies depending on how many open positions there are – if more positions are open, the funding for those positions’ benefits can be reallocated to cover the shortfall. If all positions are full, then additional funding may be needed to fill the gap between allocated funding and actual benefits expenses. Benefits costs are always increasing.
		* Noted that unfortunately we do not know the amount needed for benefits shortfall funding until the very end of the fiscal year, since it depends on how many people leave or are hired throughout the year, but the request typically needs to be approved long before then – usually a year or two in advance.
		* Explained that initially she had suggested not funding merits and benefits for the next two years, but that after hearing from Student Affairs, it seems that it should be a priority. However, she shared that she is very concerned because the most recent enrollment data and projections she has seen suggests that there will be very little funding available for this.
		* Recommended up to $300K in temporary (not permanent) benefits funding for FY2021-22, and not approving any benefits shortfall funding for FY2022-23 at this time. This also means that temporary funding for other purposes would need to decrease. Recommended decreasing the 2022-23 temporary funding allocation for requests to $1M.
		* Reviewed the budget forecast, showing that providing even this temporary funding could put the SSF Unallocated account in a very precarious position for FY2021-22, and that she was concerned that the fund might end up in deficit.
		* Noted that she is not sure how much they should rely on these projections, and that it is hard to know what exactly will happen with enrollment.
5. **Discussion on the Benefits Shortfall**
	1. **Atreyi Mitra** asked **Carina Salazar,** **Erinn McMahan** and **Charles Turner** if SFAC did not recommend funding for the budget increases and the Chancellor were to approve, how this would impact their units. **Erinn McMahan** shared that given the COVID impact this year, this would just add to the sales and service losses. Recreations production is to be at $78M in deficit by the end of the fiscal year. The additional benefits cost would add to that. In a normal year, recreation would be able to weather some of this loss with the sales and service revenue and because they are not fully dependent on 20,000 funds. He also shared that recreation has 85 fulltime staff and about 21 fulltime spots that are funded by SSF funds and that they would never have a vacancy – they would just find someone else that they could apply the funding to and who would be able to benefit from it. **Charles Turner** shared that the benefits shortfall is consistent with what they are seeing at UCOP. He shared that healthcare premiums are to increase by $10s of millions of dollar next year and that UCOP is looking at the state for additional support. He shared that the state is in a good position this year (originally thinking that the state was going to be in a huge deficit because of COVID) because the stock market held up and there has been a lot of capital gains. This drives the state budget, which is really strong this year and that there is potential for onetime funding from the state to help with these deficiencies. He shared that there is going to be a lot of onetime considerations for many constituents from governments, not just from higher Ed.

He shared that that benefits and costs are going to go up over the next several years and that adjustments are things that need to be recognized and understood. **Ellen Hermann** wanted to note that there is no state funding to supplement student services fees. However, next year, there will be no tuition fee increase, generally, no SSF increase either. She shared that the SSF budget will likely not get better for at least for a few years. **Ellen Hermann** reviewed the budget forecast spreadsheet with the committee and walked through each line item live.

1. **Preliminary Discussion on Graduate Student Needs**
	1. **Atreyi Mitra** opened the floor for **Gaby Barrios** to lead the preliminary discussion on graduate student needs. **Gaby Barrios** shared about the controversial subject around athletics and the fact that the athletics funding is so much of SFAC’ recommendations – yet for their budget, it is a very small amount of what they have in general. She shared that it was advised not put so much time around this subject, but perhaps the graduate students or a small subcommittee could put in the effort and take this topic on. She shared that changing things like this that have a lot of precedent is organizing correctly around it and strategically. Especially now since every dollar is being counted. She shared the graduate students needs are very similar to the undergraduate needs in a lot of ways – like housing and food insecurity issues. The most prevalent, though not exclusive to the graduate population, is that a lot of graduate students have families to support and are workers, which is important to keep this in mind. She shared that because of the similarities between graduate and undergraduate students, that supporting and coming together in solidarity is good for both populations. However, graduate students have a desire to deep dive into professionalization and need to be competitive on the job market in a way that is growing more every year. Agreeing on resources they’d like to see funded are the Graduate Writing Center, the Graduate Resource Center, the Career Center, and Career Counselors. She share that undergraduate students have a lot of Career Counselors and graduate students only have one. She shared that graduate students are about 28% of the student body, but with a very small percentage of resources on campus. **Bradley Alvarado** asked **Gaby Barrios** to share more on what she meant about athletics. **Gaby Barrios** shared that less than 2% of SSF funding goes to athletics and that this funding could very well affect someone’s livelihood. In the past, it was noted that the Chancellor rejected the recommendation of not permanently funding athletics, however, because of the pandemic, this would be a good opportunity to revisit this recommendation. Everybody is having an emergency situation and making the argument that they are not in the same position as the before and people’s housing insecurities are at an all-time high and people need jobs right now that will pay them to support their families. Right now, the committee has the ability to help fund these resources that will help students become members of society that are productive and that have a salary that can support them. She shared that it is really important to emphasize the fact that this is less than 2% ($2.5M) of the athletics funding but means a lot to the units that committee oversees. She shared that it would be very powerful if the undergraduate and graduate population were unified in this kind of push and to start thinking of ways to change this kind of funding and equity. **Bradley Alvarado** shared that he would like to see the athletics SSF funding to zero. He shared that the athletics department has sponsors and a lot of donations from people and that they do not need funding from SFAC, especially since their football coach is the most paid person at UCLA, which is a problem in itself. He also shared his personal grudge with athletics on how they have treated transfer students and programs in the past. He also shared that he is willing to organize outside of SFAC and that the graduate students have his support on the undergraduate side regarding SSF for athletics and could definitely find other undergraduates who support this effort as well. **Carina Salazar** shared that because supporting the needs of graduate students is a priority for SFAC this year that perhaps having Letty Trevino and JP Santos deliver a presentation to the committee would be helpful. **Ellen Hermann** shared that athletics is already spending more than they have and if the committee takes away their $2.5M, there will be people who will not be able to get funded and also shared that coaches’ salaries are not a part of SSF funds. **Atreyi Mitra** asked **Gaby Barrios** is she would like to chair the subcommittee to discuss the funding of athletics what she envisioned the subcommittee looking like. **Gabby Barrios** accepted to chair the subcommittee andshared that that they would have to look at the specifics of what is funded and what has been funded so far and what kind of financial argument can be made for reducing at least the amount of SSF funding that is going into it. **Erinn McMahan** shared that the graduate students’ needs articulated were compelling and that his advice would be to focus energy on articulating the needs of the graduate students and not just where it could come from. If the lead was anti-athletics, this would be burying the lead that graduate resources are not sufficient and properly resourced. **Laxman Dahal, Jackie Markt-Maloney** and **Bradley Alvarado** shared that they would also like to be on the subcommittee. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** shared that a related idea could be doing a unit review on athletics and the having a committee on graduate student needs that way they are not necessarily connected but could explore the roles of athletics as they explore the graduate student angle. **Samantha Solemnidad** made a motion to create a subcommittee that assesses and funds unmet graduate students’ service needs. **Bradley Alvarado** seconded. **Devanee Matcham** made a motion to appoint **Gabby Barrios** as chair to this subcommittee. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** seconded.
2. **Announcements**
	1. **Atreyi Mitra** shared that there will be no meeting next week but asked if certain subcommittee could meet for no more than an hour about the charter and bylaws as well as compensation. She also asked the committee to complete a When2Meet over the winter break to demine winter quarter SFAC meetings date and times.

**Bradley Alvarado** made a motion to adjourn the meeting and **Paarth Shah** seconded. The meeting adjourned at 2:55pm.