**Student Fee Advisory Committee Meeting**

**Room 2206 , Murphy Hall**

**4:30-6:30pm Tuesday, November 19, 2019**

**Present:**

Graduates: Brittnee Meitzenheimer, Denise Marshall, Jackie Markt-Malone

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

Administrative Reps: 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)

**Nicole Corona Diaz** called the meeting toorderat 4:41pm

1. **Approval of the Agenda**
	1. **Kevin Kilgore** motions to approvethe agenda and **Karen Rowe** secondsthe motion.
2. **Review of Handouts**
	1. “Master Student Amendment Language” (attached in email with 11/19 Agenda)
3. **Approval of Minutes**
	1. **Kevin Kilgore** motions to approve 11/12/19 Minutes**, Denise Marshall** secondsthat motion
4. **Discussion of Bylaw amendment regarding conflict of interest and other items requiring SFAC’s review per last year’s committee statement to Chancellor**

*Throughout this discussion many clerical suggestions are made that may not be included in the minutes*

* 1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opens the topic recollecting on the previous SFAC chair, Jazz, mentioning to the committee that the bylaws regarding conflicts of interest would have to be revised. That amendment is now active and **Nicole Corona Diaz** wants open dialogue and revisit this amendment with the committee, to be sure there is a general consensus among committee members.
	2. **Kevin** **Kilgore** ask if this has been passed already is there an option to edit. **Nicole Corona Diaz** responds,yes the bylaws regarding conflicts of interest are currently active however the previous SFAC chair communicated via letter to the chancellor that the committee would be reviewing this amendment
	3. **Christine Wilson** mentions at the end of the 2016-17 year, the committee asked for this to be added to the bylaws, the Chancellor did not respond within the required two week time frame mandated in the bylaws. The Chancellor says in response “I want the committee to consider all repercussions of this decision”. The committee the following year chose not to push hard for a response from the Chancellor, therefore on May 9th the committee added its changes to the Bylaws and made Chancellor aware, noting that the committee had told the Chancellor that they would review the entire charter including the amendment. **Christine Wilson** lastly mentions her intentions were to tell history of the amendment and why.
	4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** says the biggest issue the committee is how this amendment applies to students. She then opens the floor for comments
	5. **Denise** **Marshall** says her issue with the amendment is the language “hired under the entity,” referring to the students and some staff not being to vote but because they work in a particular department at which the votes are specific to. She then goes on to mention there are 900 students receiving financial aid, many of which work in different areas of the school. She empathizes with the students who’s will be penalized. She doesn’t work for the school anymore and now she can make recommendations
	6. **Deb Geller** says conflict of interest should exclude you from voting but not being part of the discussion. She feels there are subject matter experts and they are best people with knowledge and should therefore be included in the discussion. The intention behind this rationale is to be able to share information with everyone rather than lead the outcomes. **Deb Geller** mentions in her experience through student government or City Council this is how it has worked.

**Deb Geller** then gives her personal opinion regarding the role of students. She refers to students as unique stakeholders. They rarely have the power to influence how money is spent and no student should be barred from voting because they don’t personally benefit from financial decisions made. It’s different if they are on the board or are seeking money for their specific position. Someone who has a student assistant job or a work study position doesn’t have the kind of influence that would warrant them being barred from voting.

**Deb Geller** recommends we should draft language to say faculty and staff should be prevented from voting on funding allocations from which their salary is paid.

* 1. **Paulina Macias** mentions other ways student can be biased not be held accountable. She argues there is no difference between working-student’s conception about a department and students’ conception who use the departments’ services. **Paulina Macias** expresses concerns that the students who work in these departments are low-income students and their opinions are marginalized. She mentions she agrees with much of what **Deb Geller** said previously has disagreed with this amendment since last year when it was introduced.
	2. **Karen Rowe** says there are large amounts of money for the Bruin Resource Center the director has recused himself because of the conflict of interest.
	3. **Atreyi Mitra** says she agrees with much of what **Deb Geller** said however she disagrees with the statement that students don’t have a vested interest or much control over where money is allocated. **Atreyi Mitra** then confesses she may be considered to have a conflict of interest if this were the case. She says since she does work for a department she is emotionally biased and want to support her coworkers even though the decision doesn’t direct where the money goes.

* 1. **Deb Geller** reiterates the definition of Conflict Of Interest, “a situation in which a person is in a position to derive personal benefit from actions or decisions made in their official capacity.” Just because you have an interest in something doesn’t give you a conflict. She questions how that determination is made. If you feel you are conflicted personally and are biased this has to be a personal judgement call to omit yourself from voting. People who don’t have the power to change things should not have a barrier put on them to represent the student body. Deb gives colorful examples of roles within an organizations that do not direct an entity and should be allowed provide useful insight.

**Deb Geller** touches on **Paulina Macias’** point that this amendment is marginalizing students who have to work on campus and also adds they probably have a better grasp on the departments then students who do not work on campus. She mentioned the latter to add context to the fact that the student government has decided who they want to represent the student body and we shouldn’t allow this amendment to create barriers and having the full opportunity be heard.

* 1. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** says people who have personal bias should abstain from voting. She mentions we don’t penalize students who benefit from the services (students who use a department service) but we penalize students who work there and thinks they could both be equally biased, so where do we draw the line. She agrees work study students are being marginalized
	2. **Kevin Kilgore** says to **Karen Rowe** point we need to trust that people voting are adults and the chair has a responsibility to have a public or private conversation with someone wielding power that could be a possible conflict of interest.
	3. **Karen Rowe** she has a slightly different perspective being apart of the administrative staff. In the position of a person in power to make decision she would recuse herself without a formal bylaw requiring her to.
	4. **Karen Patron** say she agrees with **Deb Geller** and reiterates that parameters around faculty she be restricted to they cannot vote but they are allow to be in discussion. Students on the other hand are only in college for 4 years and this their chance to express their opinions
	5. **Christine** **Wilson** recites former bylaws mentioning she spent nine years on SFAC, three years as a graduate student, and six years as an administrator. In her experience on the committee, the process was that all students participated in the discussion and voting for requests. Only administrators directly connected to the units were recused from the discussion and the voting.
	6. **Denise** **Marshall** asks is the old amendment available and what changes were made. **Deb Geller** repliesit’s available and the older version did not prohibit students from engaging but had the same barrier on faculty voting.
	7. **Nicole Corona Diaz** says if you have very specific language you would like to add you can forward to her. Next week we will continue the discussions and she will also come up with a few options that encompasses everyone’s feedback and so we can continue the discussion.
1. **Finalize Masters Student Amendment to Charter**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** suggest the committee should review this Charter amendment on their own time so that next week any suggestions or revisions can be added immediately. Reading it all here together will take time away from other agenda items and will not give enough time for well thought out critiques. It will be more effective to read this at home then return to the next meeting with ideas of revision. Dragging this out for weeks is not a good idea due to the fact the holiday are approaching.
	2. **Karen Rowe** can we make sure we ascertain what was already groundwork has already been completed. She believes some of the amendments have already been voted and everyone having that information will make the process streamlined.
	3. **Nicole Corona Diaz** opens up discussion for any comments or suggestions.
	4. **Karen Patron** suggest the small verbiage change in the amendment to Charter. **Nicole Corona Diaz** makes adjustments to the amendment based on **Karen Patron’s** suggestion.
	5. **Deb Geller** expresses her concern with the lack of continuity and possibility of having a year with no two-year appointment and no one who can serve in a leadership role. She then suggests that this information would serve a better as a standalone statement because clarity is currently not mentioned in the transfer amendment.
	6. **Ellen Hermann** asked if the group wanted to include all graduate students, including PhDs, rather than just specifying masters students to avoid drafting another separate amendment at a later time.
	7. **Deb Geller** says not finishing a term and having someone else complete the remainder of the term is setup to keep the terms staggered which allows continuity. Otherwise, you could have three people turnout at the same time and not be able to find an eligible candidate for the next cycle. The undergrad example was specific to transfers, because they only have two years here and there's limited opportunity. A PhD student has far more than two, often seven, and plenty of opportunity to be appointed and be available for two years. If the parallel is to transfers, which is a carve out of undergrads who have only two years maximum here, then the Masters where the programs are a maximum of two years is the parallel rather than grad.
	8. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** suggest the language should be along the lines of “GSA may nominate a graduate student who will only be here for one year or will only have a one year program”. She wants the meaning to match our intention, and let them understand our intention.
	9. **Nicole Corona Diaz** ask the group what direction are we headed? **Nicole Corona Diaz** makes preliminary corrections but no actions can be taken immediately. We must wait 7 days until action can be taken. **Nicole Corona Diaz** ask group if they agree with the changes made so far, **Kevin Kilgore** agrees.
	10. **Nicole Corona Diaz** concludes editing this amendment. She tables the discussion for next week due to the 7 day time restriction put on voting after reviewing.
2. **Draft of letter asking the Chancellor, to allow units to use recently allocated SSF funds flexibly(within guidelines) to make some programs whole and de-emphasize others**
	1. **Nicole Corona Diaz** suggest proposing the possibility of drafting a letter to the chancellor that would ask for flexibility in allocation of fund to programs. She suggests it would make more sense to fund programs two to three programs fully rather than partially funded 6 different programs. **Nicole Corona Diaz** says her priority is to allow programs to use money they have already been approved for, in a way that fit their most immediate needs.
	2. After many explanations to the committee **Deb Geller** reiterates **Nicole Corona Diaz’s** explanation of the intended purpose of this letter stating, “Last year, some of these funding decisions were partially funded. Maybe to fund the person not the program” or vice versa. **Deb Geller** also mentions these scenarios have created significant issues in the past where programs weren’t able to operate optimally due to funding issues.
	3. **Karen Rowe** mentions the funding was based on each programs top priorities. It’s hard to know how to set parameters. **Karen Rowe** believes reallocating funds will make this more complicated.
	4. **Nicole Corona Diaz** says she has suggested this idea to EMG members and they said this can be helpful. She brings up this topic for discussion to get feedback from the SFAC but it’s not going to happen if we are not all on board. makes suggestion on how accountability will be taken care but it’s something
	5. **Janay Williams** questions how the committee will hold programs accountable for line items. How do we know they are going to spend the money appropriately? **Nicole Corona Diaz** respondsSFAC has the authority for any accountability method, she insist they will have to provide proof of expenditures outside of line items.
	6. **Christine Wilson** provided an example of how units may utilize their funding creatively. In this scenario, SFAC provides funding for two graduate students. If the unit doesn’t spend the money on the two students, the unit may run the risk of losing funding due to carry forward because they were good stewards of their funding. If the unit uses the funding for one student and the rest for programming, then it can be argued that the funding wasn’t used correctly.
	7. **Kevin Kilgore** ask if this was approved do we have the time to hold these programs accountable.
	8. **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** questions if we should be dictating to how programs spend their money; ultimately the Chancellor does this and not the committees. Regardless of if the committee has time to provide oversight **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** questions if they should.
	9. **Ellen Hermann** agrees with **Brittnee Meitzenheimer** that policing programs may not be the best idea. She doubts the committee will be able to check that level of detail and cautions against putting that kind of responsibility on the committee and recommends we trust our programs with the flexibility to make the program work
	10. **Christine Wilson** says you may want to think about how they moved money around. The reality is that SFAC won’t be able to check every receipt but they will get into their heads that someone is holding them accountable.
	11. **Nicole Corona Diaz** wants to continue this discussion next week.
3. **PRG appointments**
	1. **Karen Rowe** moves and **Karen KP Patron** secondsto appoint **Jackie Markt-Malone** and **Atreyi Mitra** to be appointed to PRG.
4. **Announcements**
	1. No Announcements
5. **Adjournment**
	1. **Britnee Meitzenheimer** motions to adjourn meeting **Karen Rowe** seconds at 6:29pm.