**Student Fee Advisory Committee**

**12:00-2:00pm**

**Friday, May 28, 2021**

**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: **David Navar**

**Atreyi Mitra** called the meeting to order at 12:10pm.

1. **Approval of Week 9 Agenda**
   1. **Gabby Barrios** made a motion to remove Reviewing Unit Review Feedback from the agenda. **Bradley Alvarado** seconded the motion. The committee approved the motion unanimously.
   2. **Laxman Dahal** made a motion to add Approving the Compensation Policies Recommendations to the agenda. **Devanee Matcham** seconded the motion. The committee approved the motion unanimously.
2. **Approving the Compensation Policies Recommendations**
   1. **Atreyi Mitra** opened the floor for **Bradley Alvarado** to share SFAC Policies on Student Service Compensation. **Bradley Alvarado** discussed the policy that hinders students from being paid for SFAC and other organizations/committees that students are part of. The recommendations considered:
   2. Alternative Two: No student member of SFAC shall be restricted from receiving remuneration from SFAC due to participation in another committee or campus governing body. To promote a broader basis of student participation, committees under this compensation policy are encouraged to use diverse recruitment strategies.
   3. Alternative Three: To promote broader base of student participation, no student individual may receive remuneration from SFAC exceeding [$5k] in annual compensation if they receive remuneration from GSA/USA, ASUCLA Board of Directors or ASUCLA Communications Board.
   4. **Atreyi Mitra** shared that she preferred Alternative Three. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** shared that she preferred the language in Alternative Two. **Bradley Alvarado** shared that Council Members are compensated by receiving a paid in full tuition, which is $13k. Council Members 100% cannot serve on SFAC.

The committee voted 6 in favor for Alternative Three and 3 for Alternative Two.

* 1. **Bradley Alvarado** recommended adding the following to the policy: Students registered and enrolled less than full time, such as in under a restricted fee plan are still eligible for payment under this compensation policy. The committee was in favor of this addition to the policy.
  2. **Bradley Alvarado** and **Gabby Barrios** recommended adding the following to the policy: Compensated Members are expected to give roughly 24 hours in advance notice of any absence, when possible. After the second absence in one quarter, the chairperson may speak with the member about their intention to notifying the appointing body about the attendance issues, and subsequently go through with the notification after speaking with the member in question. Items 7a provides guidelines to assist in the determination of whether an absence is excused (7a was shared with committee on screen). The committee was in favor of this addition to the policy
  3. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** recommended adding the following options policy:

(1) keep the original language of the policy. (2) Change the language to: Students shall be entitled to receive compensation only for the time when they are officially eligible, as a member of the committee. Students, shall be compensated, based on the number of meetings they attended and participate in; or (3) Students shall be entitled to receive compensation only for the time they are officially eligible. As a member of the committee, students shall be compensated, based on the number of meetings they attend and participate in. Individuals who receive compensation subsequently withdraws from the University resigned from the committee or for any other reasons, sees to be eligible to serve shall only be paid for meetings attended. The committee voted 9 in favor, 0, 0 for option 3.

1. **Merit and Benefits Increase Discussion** 
   1. **Atreyi Mitra** asked **Christine Wilson** to go over the draft of the letter to the Chancellor regarding the merits and benefits shortfall.
   2. **Christine Wilson** explained that she had drafted the letter based on the committee discussion and that it seemed like many people had looked at the letter because there were comments and suggestions on the document, but that she wanted be sure that the letter accurately captured the committee’s views and to accept additional edits for clarity. **Christine Wilson** also stated that she did not complete the final recommendation portion of the letter, because the committee needs to decide if there is a message that it would like to send regarding the current inability to fund the merit and benefits shortfalls, which is a significant year over year de fact budget cut to departments as the majority of their permanent SSF funding goes to staff.
   3. **Christine Wilson** explained the circumstances that is forcing SFAC to choose between recommending ongoing temporary funding for positions and programs – most of which the committee believes are of critical importance and should be permanently funded – and recommending the allocation of permanent funding for merits and benefits. The SSF fee has not gone up since 2017-2018. Since that time there have been 2 merit increases for policy covered staff, and significant increases for represented staff – primarily because these staff only recently became represented. Benefits costs generally increase each year, though unfilled positions meant no shortfall in benefits for 2020-2021, but as these positions are filled the costs will begin to increase again.
   4. **Charles Turner** said that there is also an unexpected mandated 3% salary increase for policy covered staff for 2021-2022.
   5. **Christine Wilson** noted that this unexpected salary increase is not reflected in scenario 2 and will be an additional budget cut for departments if the committee does not recommend funding the merit and benefits shortfalls for next year. Because merits and benefits require permanent funds and allocating permanent funds reduces the amount of temporary funds the committee has to recommend for the long-term temp positions and programs they care about. The SSF-funded student services departments are losing either way – the don’t get their temporary funds to cover a position, the cut a budget cut that forces them to eliminate a position. There is just not enough money to do it all. The cohort model fee increases that are likely in 2022-2023 and 2023-2024, will be small and won’t be enough to permanentize the critical positions that are temp funded now, nor will be it be enough to cover merit and benefits shortfalls. SFAC will need think beyond the questions of how much money can we recommend this year for temp requests. It is not a sustainable model and not what SFACs were created to do.
   6. **Christine Wilson** also explained that there is about $1.5m in unallocated permanent SSF. The amount of temporary funds that SFAC is able to make recommendations on is equal to the unallocated balance at the end of the previous fiscal year. As it stands now, the recommendation the 2018-2019 committee made, and which was approved by the Chancellor, to cover merits and benefits with permanent funds for 2019-2020 and 2020-2021, cannot be fully honored without reducing the temporary commitments made by last year’s committee for 2021-2022 by about $500k. You have already decided that you are choosing the second funding scenario presented by APB - honoring the temporary commitments for 2021-2022 and allocating only $115k in permanent funding toward 20000 merit and benefits shortfall and expecting that temporary 20002 funds will be used to fill the hole in the 20002 funded areas. This is a band aid solution because these costs must be backfilled with permanent SFF funds, or staff will need to be cut as the cost of merits and benefits will continue to increase with no funds to cover them.
   7. **Christine Wilson** explained that she thinks the committee has three choices.
   8. Continue to keep $1.5 in unallocated perm in the unallocated account so that future committees can make recommendations for temp funding – which will fund less and less each year as costs go up each year for those positions as well.
   9. Recommend allocating $1m+ in permanent funding to cover what you see as the most urgent needs, getting SFAC out of the business of being a funding body and returning to what its mission is as established by Regental and UCOP policy. The perm funds available will not be sufficient to cover merits and benefits and to permanentize all of the ongoing temp requests. You do not have time to make thoughtful decisions on this now, but it could be taken up early next year.
   10. Look at reallocating SSF funds from areas that are not as a high of a priority for student services. With merits and benefits increasing, long-term temporary funded positions that should be permanentized, and very little new permanent SSF on the horizon, this option can keep the student services that you view as most critical from losing staff, but it also is a recommendation that would only be considered if it were very specific and made a good case for where the funds come from and to where they should go. This would also have to be taken up next year, preferably early in the year, as this would be a very recommendation, with significant ramifications.
   11. **Erinn McMahan** said that the letter seemed more like a summary of the problem with no specific request. **Gaby Barrios** suggested language to make it clearer that the committee would be looking at this issue next year and consider the possibility of recommending reallocation of funds, and also to state that it was not a good practice that Student Affairs should not be asking for temporary funding in amounts that, if funded, make it impossible to cover the merits and benefit shortfalls.
   12. The adjustments to the letter were made, and it was unanimously approved, with the provision that the Chair may make edits for grammar and clarity.
2. **SFAC Chair elections**
   1. **Gaby Barrios** and **Samantha Solemnidad** were nominated to be SFAC Chair for FY 2021-22. **Gaby Barrios** accepted the nomination and **Samantha Solemnidad** declined.
   2. Committee drafted questions for **Gaby Barrios.**
      1. **Samantha Solemnidad** proposed asking, what are your priorities for SFAC next year.
      2. **Bradley Alvarado** proposed asking, how do you envision utilizing your position as chair to bring positive change within SFAC and then within UCLA.
      3. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** proposed asking,how do you envision being able to maintain objectivity as a SFAC Chair in light of your social views.
         * **Christine Wilson s**hared adding, how does your position as a union rep affect your position on SFAC.
      4. **Bradley Alvarado** proposed asking, how do you envision maximizing the power CSF.
   3. **Gaby Barrios** gave an opening statement. She shared that one things that was important for next year is to start educating the student members earlier - giving the committee a glossary of terms, or PowerPoint. She shared that it slows things down learning as you go, for example financial spreadsheets and she would like to maintain the SFAC priorities that important and still relevant. She also shared that she has knowledge of the university structure as a whole, which she hopes to continue to bring to SFAC, not only as the position of a graduate student but as someone involved in GSA, who has contacts with university administration, through a lot of different venues of campus committees and union. She also addressed the committee members who were leaving and asked them to share what was important for the committee to continue next year.
   4. The committee asked their following questions:
      1. **Charles Turner** asked, what are your priorities for SFAC next year?
         * **Gaby Barrios** shared another priority is to bring SFAC back from being seen as a piggy bank of a lot of units, to being understood as the official responsibility, which is an Advisory Body. She shared the goal is to steer the university's image of SFAC because that is where power lies and to be able to make advising decisions about the entirety of the student fees.
      2. **Bradley Alvarado** asked, how will you ensure a welcoming environment within SFAC, considering that most of the committee members will be new next year.
         * **Gaby Barrios** shared that in addition to orientation, she would like to have an informal get together to address any questions not asked during orientation and to make everyone feel comfortable.
      3. **Devanee Matcham** asked, how do you envision using your role as chair to bring positive change to SFAC.
         * **Gaby Barrios** shared a positive change could be looking at the entirety of the funds and revisiting conversations held earlier in the year that seemed impossible. Now with more experienced, help new students and the new committee focus on how to advise on shifting money around to really have the funds come back to the students. She shared that she would like to assign each committee members a role to break labor of looking through spreadsheets and bylaws to make sure roles are understood and that the committee understands how to advise about money better.
      4. **Samantha Solemnidad** asked, how does your position as a Union Rep affect how you will lead SFAC.
         * **Gaby Barrios** shared that her position as a Union Rep is an asset for SFAC because she is fully aware of what is possible and what is not possible within the university and employment structures.
      5. **Jackie Markt-Maloney** asked, how do you envision maximizing the power of CSF.
         * **Gaby Barrios** shared that the best strategy with statewide and UC wide bodies is to really see what the dynamic is, see what the goal settings have been in the past, and try to advocate for the students. For example, she would be most aware of student needs, however, because of her position in her own Union, she is aware of statewide level situations, especially with graduate students and undergraduate employees who are represented by her Union as well. She also shared that it depends on personalities in the committee and going from there. No matter what the buildup or makeup of the committee, there are goals to reach as a representative of UCLA SFAC.
      6. **Laxman Dahal** asked, how do you plan to address the needs of graduate students as SFAC Chair.
         * **Gaby Barrios** shared graduate student needs is definitely her number one priority, but also wanted to note that graduate and undergraduate needs co-related. She shared the reason why SFAC does not understand how our student services work is because the committee is siloed into graduate services versus undergraduate student services and shared that it is important to bring them back together again and understand how to fully utilize the services for everybody. A part of that is giving feedback to the units if they are not properly advertising themselves or properly doing their jobs and then evaluating the unit at the end of the year to see if they implemented the feedback. Overall, working with the undergraduate members of SFAC to really have an idea of student priorities as a whole.
   5. **Gaby Barrios** gave a closing statement, said goodbye to committee members leaving and thanked the committee for their trust.
   6. **Gaby Barrios** was appointed SFAC Chair for FY 2021-22.
3. **Reviewing Charter & Bylaws letter** 
   1. The committee reviewed the Charter and Bylaws letter. **Bradley Alvarado** made a motion to approve the letter design to the Chancellor, allowing for a) increasing its clarity and b) grammatical edits. **Devanee Matcham** seconded the motion. The committee approved the motion unanimously.

**Gaby Barrios** made a motionto adjourn the meeting. **Devanee Matcham** seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 1:52pm.