STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

2325 Murphy Hall

Monday, May 22, 2017

**Attendees Present:**

Graduates: Manpreet Dhillon Brar, May Bhetraratana, & Nicole Ngaosi

Undergraduates: Neemat Abdusemed, Ashraf Beshay(Chair), Katie Kim, & Richard White

Administration: John Bollard, Ashe Student Health Center

Nancy Greenstein, Director of Police Community Services

Paolo Velasco, Director of Bruin Resource Center

Faculty: Karen Rowe, Professor

Advisor: Marilyn Alkin, SFAC Advisor (Ex-Officio)

Matt Quigley, Academic Planning and Budget (Ex-Officio)

Absent: Theresa Ambo, Graduate Rep

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m.

1. **Approval of Agenda**
   * 1. A motion was made by ***Katie Kim*** and seconded by ***John Bollard*** to approve the agenda. The vote passed unanimously.
2. **Review of Handouts**
   * 1. Unit Response Letters
     2. Draft Letters
     3. Bylaw amendment
     4. Bylaw amendment vote document from USAC bylaws
3. **Review of Minutes** 
   * 1. A motion was made by ***Nicole Ngaosi*** and seconded by ***May Bhetraratana*** to approve the minutes from 5/8/17. There were 8 votes to approve and 2 votes to abstain and the vote passed.
     2. A motion was made by ***Katie Kim*** and seconded by ***Nicole Ngaosi*** to approve the minutes from 5/15/17. There were 8 votes to approve and 2 votes to abstain and the vote passed.

**ENTER Executive Session**

***Karen Rowe*** moved and seconded by ***Neemat Abdusemed*** to move into executive session. The vote passed unanimously.

1. **CAPS Permanent Funding Request Finalize**
2. **Finalize High Partial and Medium Decisions**
3. **Review Recommendation Letter Draft**

**EXIT EXECUTIVE SESSION**

***Nicole Ngaosi*** moved and seconded by ***John Bollard*** to exit executive session. The vote was approved unanimously.

1. **By-law Amendment**
   1. After reviewing the ASUCLA by-law and ***Karen Rowe’s*** recommendation, ***Ashraf Beshay*** clarified about the description of conflict of interest and if it was not clear, the committee could vote.
      1. ***Richard White*** passed out the USAC by-laws because undergraduate members are appointed. He stated that if any person is asked to recuse themselves because they are employees and are proper and authorized, the proposed by-law would infringe on the USAC by-law.
         1. ***Katie Kim*** felt the USAC by-law stated the opposite because there is divided loyalty to a unit which people have, as employees.
         2. ***Nicole Ngaosi*** stated that this by-law amendment went against SFAC being a student-led committee. This by-law amendment reduced the student voice in which all students pay SSF fees and are financially invested with the outcomes.
         3. ***Katie Kim*** stated that recused members are not obligated to accept the committee’s recommendations. The recusal is for the first conversation and could provide their opinion during the second discussion.
         4. ***Nicole Ngaosi*** believed that the first conversation is the most important because the subcommittee knows the unit the best and provides the most valuable information. We trust the group to direct the questions to but every representative should be a part of the discussion. She felt it was hypocritical to reward units with funding to employ students but then based on different level of scrutiny are ask students to leave for the first conversation. This process weakens the students as a whole.
         5. ***Ashraf Beshay*** stated that this amendment is to create a safe space to speak not silencing anyone. Members recuse themselves and then offer their recommendations and vote. He felt he is setting the bare minimum so the Chancellor and administrators respect the committee’s decisions.
         6. ***Richard White*** stated that the USAC president stated that this amendment was not acceptable. ***Richard White*** will appeal to the J-Board because they are over appointees.
         7. ***Katie Kim*** stated that the language being used implies there is a negative perspective that is put on recusal which is supposed to unbiased. She was baffled and agreed that the initial conversation was important but asked what was stopping students from asking questions and clarification from these discussions when they returned. This amendment does not exclude or attack students because they work a job, as recusal is not a consequence of working.
         8. ***Richard White*** stated that if this bylaw is passed, if you work at these three places Recreation, Housing, and CPO, you cannot come to the meetings because they employee the most students on campus. So that limits the amount of students that could even be on SFAC.
         9. ***Ashraf Beshay*** explained that this statement is not true. He stated that students can speak on about 90% of the other requests and the other 10% are where members would step out of the initial conversations. Members would still be able to vote on these recommendations. Because he understands the importance of this, he is willing to make this amendment this year.
         10. ***John Bollard*** stated that based on his experience on boards, conflict of interest is used to protect people of divided loyalty and was amazed SFAC did not have conflict of interest already. If there was any association with a group, you do not participate or vote. He thought this was a good foundation of a document.
         11. ***Nicole Ngaosi*** was concerned about representatives with perceived conflict of interest. She asked how this could be determined. The recusal process should come from the committee member themselves. She brought up that ***Manpreet Dhillon Brar*** did not recuse herself from last year’s discussion when she was a part of a unit. ***Ashraf Beshay*** stated that it is up to the individual because perceived conflict of interest is on ASUCLA 2/3 vote is a high threshold.
         12. ***Manpreet Dhillon Brar*** wanted to clarify that last year, having this in the by-laws would make it clear. She reached out to the chair after the fact and clarified but it was too late. She doesn’t think she should be identified as unfair treatment because this was not clear.
         13. ***Paolo Velasco*** stated that he will abstain from this vote because he believed this was a student issue even though he has thoughts on the matter. He preferred to leave out employment because students also use Ashe and/or Recreation. He felt that employment piece can make it clear. An employer can put undue influence on an employee which may have consequences. If you are not an employee, you may not have an issue. He believed this was important and recognized the value of the recusal process as well thinks it is challenging when students are not part of the discussion.
         14. ***Karen Rowe*** found it unusual there wasn’t a recusal process and if self-initiated, can be based on employment but also there are students who recuse themselves based on conflict of interest. Conflict of interest could be a student who is using the facilities of education but if it were a member of the committee who was using the services, it would a clear conflict of interest. She trusts that students would recuse themselves if they felt conflict of interest.
         15. ***May Bhetraratana*** appreciated both sides and her experience with past committees which were standard practices, felt it was a standard and it was a low standard compared to past committees. She felt fine with the amendment which sets the minimum that needed to be set.
         16. ***Neemat Abdusemed*** was disappointed this is the discussion because she does not like conflict. She sees both sides and stands clear with those opposed to the by-law. There are different levels of conflict of interest and there are loopholes. In the past, some people did stay or didn’t. There are employees who are less bias than others who are volunteers, when would it be used and to whom and targeted at a higher rate than other units. This targets different units than others.
         17. ***Ashraf Beshay*** agreed there are loopholes but feels this lays the foundation. ***Neemat Abdusemed*** stated that with this foundation, it could continue to exclude more and more people.
         18. ***Katie Kim*** stated that she respects her committee members but was curious because if she worked for a unit, she’d want to tell the unit that she is part of SFAC. She asked if they felt they were reached out to from the unit because they were on SFAC and whether the unit influenced or created bias. She found it hard to believe that there was no bias or influence when you work for unit.
             1. ***Neemat Abdusemed*** felt that CPO was a space for her. Based on how the units that benefited students, there is already bias or is this called bias. ***Katie Kim*** understood that everyone has dispositions towards units.
             2. ***Katie Kim*** asked if anyone had been reached out to by a supervisor or coworkers knowing they were an influential member on SFAC based on the unit requests. ***Neemat Abdusemed***, ***Richard White***, and ***Nicole Ngaosi*** all stated they were not reached out to. ***Nicole Ngaosi*** stated that every committee member has benefited from a conversation at some point in time. The administrative reps benefited from the discussions about what was needed in strong funding requests.
             3. ***Ashraf Beshay*** stated that this conversation was not held with other entities. ***Nicole Ngaosi*** felt that a standard of practice should be for any unit that may have an interest of submitting a funding request and receive information on what makes a strong funding request.
             4. ***Neemat Abdusemed*** reiterated that ***Nancy Greenstein*** stated that when a staff member had a conflict of interest during the meeting, they were asked to leave and that method should be practiced.
             5. ***Karen Rowe*** stated that the USAC document is quite clear but ***Richard White*** stated that the amendment specifically identifies student workers. ***Nancy Greenstein*** stated that the USAC bylaw can be used for guidance but the SFAC committee is different.
             6. There were 9 votes to approve, one of which was an absentee vote, and 3 votes against. The anonymous vote passed.
2. **Chair Election**
   * 1. ***Nicole Ngaosi*** withdrew from the election and respects ***Richard White*** and based on recent SFAC history, she supports the first Black chair.
     2. ***Richard White*** shared that everyone worked hard this year and thanked everyone for the nomination. He shared that he was from San Bernardino, CA which is low SES background and was honored to be on this committee. He has to work to stay on this committee. He believed SFAC should applaud student workers, tackles to address the space issue, and hopes to be more included with CSF such as having everyone join the meeting this summer. He also wanted to address the expediting the funding request recommendation process.
     3. ***Ashraf Beshay*** asked the committee for questions.
        1. ***May Bhetraratana*** asked what the three top issues were for SFAC.
           1. ***Richard White*** stated that space. Because the referendum was brought up but the space is used by students so there should be some input for SFAC to fund although he was unsure about paying rent.
           2. Expediting the funding request process. Next year there will be a lot of new graduate students and will need to get everyone acclimated to the process in the first few weeks but they could also start site visits earlier on.
        2. ***Katie Kim*** asked that since the bylaw amendment passed, will he continue to submit his complaint to the J-board and will he be able to successfully apply this bylaw next year since he opposes the amendment.
           1. He believes it should be looked in to because the amendment specifically includes student workers.
           2. He believes that the initial conversation of conflict of interest will be shared at the start so students know whether to be employed by a unit in which ***Karen Rowe*** included the clarity that they would be recused from the initial discussion.
        3. ***Nicole Ngaosi*** asked how he would reach out to parenting and transfer students to encourage them to be part of SFAC.
           1. He stated that he could let the appointing groups to know what experiences they are looking for in appointed student positions.
        4. ***Karen Rowe*** moved and ***Paolo Velasco*** seconded to extend the questions. There were 7 votes approved and 1 opposed.
        5. Paolo asked how he would solicit the input of graduate students
        6. ***Karen Rowe*** asked about his strengths and weaknesses.
           1. He stated that his voice was his strength. He is a team player and wants everyone to contribute to the conversation. His weakness is that he’s too nice.
        7. ***Ashraf Beshay*** asked how can you separate your personal opinion and deal with conflict when they arise and bring people together.
           1. Although he was not as vocal this year, he was vocal when needed. He would have the committee contribute to the meeting. When there is a difference of opinion, he would look to the advisor for suggestions.
        8. ***Neemat Abdusemed*** asked what was his favorite memory or thing he liked about SFAC.
           1. He stated his favorite memory was the CSF trip to Santa Cruz.
3. **CSF Report**
   * 1. Moved to next week.
4. **Announcements**
   1. ***Ashraf Beshay*** announced that there will need for an additional meeting next week to finish letters.
5. **Adjournment**
6. A motion was made by ***Katie Kim*** and seconded by ***Neemat Abdusemed*** to adjourn the meeting. The vote passed unanimously.
7. Meeting was adjourned at 6:21 pm.