UC RIVERSIDE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Student Service Fee Advisory Committee
Friday, February 27, 2015; 4:00 to 6:30 PM
HUB Room 379
Approved Meeting Minutes

Name	Association	Voting Privilege[1]	Attendance
Alexander Taliaferro	**ASUCR**	**X**	**P**
Jon Cassell	**ASUCR**	**X**	**P**
Fernando Echeverria	**ASUCR**	**X**	**L**
Sean Fahmian	**ASUCR**	**X**	**L**
Nafi Karim	**ASUCR**	**X**	**L**
Iris Jiang	**ASUCR**	**X**	**P**
Wen-Yu Chou	**ASUCR Alternate**	**-**	**A**
Jordan Meltzer	**ASUCR Alternate**	**-**	**P**
Suraj Wadhwani	**ASUCR Alternate**	**-**	**P**
David Chavez	**GSA**	**X**	**A**
Terrance Stewart	**GSA**	**X**	**L**
Jason Rothman	**GSA**	**X**	**P**
Ted Mock	**Faculty**	**X**	**P**
Luis Alvarez	**Staff**	**X**	**A**
Cindy Flannery	**Staff**	**X**	**P**
Susana Salazar	**Ex-Officio RP&B**	**-**	**P**
Cathy Eckman	**Ex-Officio VCSA**	**-**	**P**
Diana Echeverria	**Secretary**	**-**	**P**
Sue Lillie	**Staff Support**	**-**	**P**

P: Present   A: Absent   L: Late   E: Excused   [1] X indicates voting privilege

1) Call to Order: **4:05 PM**

2) Approval of Agenda
Motion to Approve Agenda by Jason Rothman, Second by Jon Cassell.
Vote: Yes: 7, No: 0, No: 0
Agenda Approved Unanimously

3) Approval of Minutes for 2/20/2015
Motion to Approve Minutes by Jon Cassell, Second by Jason Rothman
Vote: Yes: 5, No: 0, Abstain: 2
Minutes Approved Unanimously.

4.) CSF Update
 Alex Taliaferro: Sean, Jon and I went to the Council on Student Fees conference this past weekend. We mostly worked on CSF's three campaigns. These are:
-A funding stream assessment campaign, pertaining to the way UCOP takes taxes from various campuses and to make sure that no student service fee is being overly taxed through a new method implemented two years ago.

-The data acquisition campaign which is a survey on student fee usage on different campuses. This is to guide SSFAC'S uses across the UC in order to make allocations best fit the student will. We will be approving questions for our UCR surveys next meeting.

-The referenda campaign which deals with compulsory based fees passed through referenda. The idea of this campaign was to ensure that every referendum that is passed and that collects student fees has a sunset clause and a reaffirmation clause for all other compulsory based fees. It allows students to have a say on fees that were passed many years ago that may no longer be valid.

Jon Cassell: I was going work on the streamline campaign. If anybody wants to go over the referenda with me, please come and see me.

Alex Taliaferro: We did draft CSF standing policy 8. I will let you read it over. It basically outlines what CSF feels are the appropriate actions for a campus based fee before being put on the ballot. The big points here is the fact that it has a sunset clause, a reaffirmation clause, and the establishment of an over sight committee to make sure that these are met. That would be number 7 on the standing policy. It also says SSFAC is to check whether referendums have these sunset clauses and reaffirmation dates before being put on the ballot. It has been voted on and passed by CSF but now it has to ratified by the majority of the individual campus SSFACs. So each UC SSFAC is now voting on these in their own meetings and a majority vote will solidify this as one of CSF's standing policies. We have included standing policy 6 because it is referenced in the first paragraph of standing policy 8.

Motion to approve Standing Policy 8 as one of the CSF standing policies
Vote: Yes: 3, No:0, Abstain: 4
Standing Policy 8 Passes.

5) Subcommittee D Presentation on Recommendations
a) Committee Discussion
The Well
Jason Rothman: For their priority one, the Student Wellness Partners Program, they request $60,000. We recommend to fully funding that, being as it seems to be the entire purpose of the Well.

-For their second priority, we recommended to continue to fund this program. It's a continuing position. It oversees the critical functions of the department and the mental health initiatives. It's a continuing position. That's $64,890.

-The third they requested for $15,000 we recommended funding that entirely. Maybe they can work with other to consolidate their printer costs. In the future that's something all the departments should look at.

- The fourth priority was a grad student intern. We recommended funding that entirely.

- Their initial request was $86,233 but that number was actually incorrect that actual amount is $146,173. Our sub-committee recommends funding in its entirety.

Sean Fahmian: The Student Wellness Partners programming is a coalition of 10-20 different departments. I don't know why The Well is requesting this whole thing. Could you elaborate on that?

Jason Rothman: They stated that that $60,000 makes up 2/3rds of the entire amount that the Student Wellness Partners actually costs. It's an ongoing cost; they haven't increased it or decreased it. One of the questions we have for The Well is whether or not they have applied for a grant.

Sean Fahmian: If you were to have to make cuts on any of these, where would you?

Jason Rothman: I would think that if they pooled their resources for office costs, which would be the easiest way to bring down without directly affecting anyone's salary or potential funding.

Student Life
Jason Rothman: They serve 15,000 students. They have continued to use their funds efficiently;

they are very frugal with what they do. They are one of the few organizations that requested money from us who posted their evaluation scores.

- Priority 1 Student Affairs I, this is the student organization advisor; we decided to fund this position fully at $61,090.

-Priority 2 is the 50% funding for the Student Affairs Officer II, this is for the Band's Campus Vitality. They requested $31,374 and we recommend not funding this at all.

-Priority 3 is funding for student assistant positions. We recommended to partially funding this in half at $15,600.

- Priority 4 - Student org online support - this is their system for Highlander Link. We recommended funding this entirely because that's core to what they do.

-They requested $144,914, we recommending funding $94,940.

- We want to ask if there are other ways to reach students. We want to ask if they have considered changing their office hours. We would recommend for them to start later.

Student Conduct

Jordan Meltzer: They serve all 21,000 students as well as the UCR Palm Desert campus.

-Priority 1   a position and that is $13,332. We recommend funding this fully because it is an already existing position.

- Priority 2 is another position that serves a similar purpose but due to the nature of decreasing funds, we decided to not fund this position. They used carryover from last year to fund this position this year.

- Priority 3 is their computing and database. We recommend funding this fully.

- Priority 4 is for student committee chairs, we decided to recommend funding this fully.

- Priority 5 which was their copier lease and space rental; we decided to not fund this. We did not fund this last year and they were able to still run.

- Priority 6 we decided to recommend funding this fully. A major reason for this is because this includes the alarm service. The people who work within this office are working with students who have done some sort of misconduct. Some students at the office may be volatile at the moment. This service allows them to be in contact with UCPD in case of an emergency.

- Priority 7 which is travel for student conduct committee meeting and training provisions. We decided not to fund this. This travel expense would be for conferences to keep up to date with policies.

- Priority 8 is for communications. We decided not to fund this because we did not fund this last year.

- Priority 9, which the Academic Integrity Seminar student facilitators which are six facilitators at roughly $10/hr. for 3 hours per week. This helps students realize what policies were violated and it helps students feel as that they are not being targeted. We recommend funding this fully.

- Priority 10 is tied to priority number 9. It is for Academic Integrity Seminar Facilitator training and supplies. We didn't fund last year and we decided not to fund this year.

- Their last priority is their front desk assistant and we decided to fully fund that. It was funded last year.

- Their total request came out to $120,222. We approved to fund them for about $44,298 and this is $4000 less than what we funded last year.

Student Health Services

Iris Jiang: This year they have one request for $40,000 to extend the women's health clinic gynecological services to a full day. This will provide an additional half day. We have recommended funding this fully considering that this service is one of the top items that have been consistently listed in their student health insurance survey that students are asking more of.

Alex Taliaferro: If they are requesting for the same amount as last year, wouldn't they be running a full day already?

Sean Fahmian: Maybe they are putting other funds towards it.

Jason Rothman: They might have some carry over. We will ask them that.

Counseling Center
Jason Rothman: We figured that UCOP should fund heavier than they do. Their request was odd.
-Priority 1 was to fund a Counseling Psychologist II, someone is already in this position and we recommended to entirely funding that which is $94,725.
- I don't remember priority 2. *[Was unable to have exact information due to technical difficulties]*
- Priority 3 - They don't have anyone in that position. The person they had before was funded from an MHSA grant. It doesn't affect their number of people since there isn't someone there in the first place. We don't recommend funding priority 3 at all.
- Priority 4 - $8,062, it's mandatory for them to have access to their medical records so we recommend funding that entirely.

6) Subcommittee C Presentation on recommendations
b) Committee Discussion
African Student Programs
Jon Cassell: We took VCSA recommendations into consideration. I think we need to reiterate to the department that this is temporary funding.
- Priority 1 fund so that they can get the position filled.
- Priority 2 - $22,000 and last year we allocated about half of that. We have funded them the same amount we did last year $11,520.
Nafi Karim:
- Priority 3, we felt they could get support from University Advancement and Undergraduate Admissions for funding for ASPTV.
Jon Cassell:
Priority 4 - fully fund $6,500.
- For their mentor program background checks, we decided to fund this 50%.
- For mail services we recommended funding fully for $3000.
-For the AVC conference we decided to continue funding this. It's vital part of outreach for them.
- Priorities 8, 9 and 10, we did not fund them last year and decided not to this year. Our total recommendation is $39,743.
Sean Fahmian: For number 5, what is your reasoning for cutting this program?
Nafi Karim: We kept it the same as last year.
Sean Fahmian: Are they looking to expand this or just to sustain it? I think it's a good initiative.
Jon Cassell: We will follow up with that.
Alex Taliaferro: Did you give any thought of giving block funding as opposed to line item funding? In his presentation he said he wanted more flexibility.
Nafi Karim: Yes, we don't have a problem with that.
Asian Student Programs
Jon Cassell:
-Priority 1 which is for student staffing, we decided to fully fund that.
- Priority 2, the new amount would be $828 and we decided to fully fund.
- For phones, photocopier, mail, we decided to fund fully.
- Priority 7, which is for supplies and materials we decided to fully fund .
- We decided to fully fund collaborative programming.
- We recommended funding $26,688 total.
Sean Fahmian: In the past we have had similar requests for collaborative programming funds and in the past we didn't fund. We felt that wasn't necessary. If they wanted to do a collaborate fund, I think they should do it through a different resource.
Fernando Echeverria: If we started funding collaborative programming, we should do it across all those departments.
Nafi Karim: We can remove it once we revise our recommendations as a whole committee.

Sean Fahmian: Are we going to be doing a general fund for phones, photocopiers and mail?

Alex Taliaferro: That might be both fair and prudent.

Sean Fahmian: In the past we had a set rate that goes towards mail and services.

Chicano Student Programs

Jon Cassell: Estella expressed that she would like to promote more outreach in the Chicano Student Programs and stressed for a new SAO I position.

Nafi Karim: We thought the new position would be beneficial to their program. As a committee if we decided to not fund new programs we would change that

Jon Cassell:

Priority 1 - student assistance, we decided to fully fund.

- We decided to fully fund insurance.

- We decided to fund general operating costs.

- We decided to fund priority 5 as well.

Nafi Karim: We thought these were beneficial line items but we can take them out in revisions.

Jon Cassell: Priority 7 - collaborative programming funds, we think that would be good for departments to have and decided to fund it. If we did have to make cuts we would go by priority and that's the last priority.

Sean Fahmian: Last year they asked for the same position and the subcommittee last year made a comparison to ASP, and they said that APSP has two positions for programming and they wanted to expand CSP to do the same. CSP is doing more programming. They are doing great without the position. Last year we decided to not fund it because they are running smoothly and are still putting on programs they want to put on.

Nafi Karim: Estella is actually almost serving as the director of two departments. The undocumented students department doesn't have an office so she is serving two roles.

Sean Fahmian: They have been doing this for the past two years without the position.

Nafi Karim: They are trying to expand and at this rate this is not sustainable. This would be a vital position for CSP but if we decide to not fund any new positions as a committee, we would not fund this position.

LGBT Services

Jon Cassell: Priority 1 - SAO I we decided to fund her position and the benefits fully such as we did last year. Having an SAO I position makes it possible to make bonds with people.

- For student assistants we decided to fund fully.

- We decided to fully fund the graduate intern stipends.

- We decided to fund programming funds.

- We decided to fund the computing fully. This is for all the licenses and software.

- We decided to fully fund the panic alarm system which is necessary for the safety of students.

- We decided to fully fund collaborative programming. If we did have to make cuts we would start with the collaborative programming.

Nafi Karim: It's the same items as last year that we funded except for the collaborative programming. The benefits have changes for the SAO I position. It's a new person in the same position.

Sean Fahmian: Last year they stressed the importance of the specific person they had and now that this is a new person I'm kind of skeptical on how that change was made. We have committed to this position now assuming it would be the same person but now it's not the same person. We can bring that up to committee discussion because it is a lot of money.

Jon Cassell: We would include that in the follow-up question. That position was fully funded by us last year and we will leave that on for now.

Middle Eastern Student Center

Jon Cassell: For priority 1, Tina stressed the importance of having someone in the office when someone walks in. This is something we thought is critical for the department so we decided to fully fund the 3 student assistants. We funded two students last year.

- They asked for the student computer workstation iPads and they stressed that their computers are acting up. We think having up to date technology is a base to send out emails and using more media. We decide to fund fully because they will benefit from the new technology.
- We decided to fund fully speakers and workshops.
- For their leadership training and student counselor retreat, we funded those last year and we decided to fund that this year.
- Their cultural celebration is important to bring student together as a whole so we decided to fund fully.
- Their collaborative programming funds, we decided to fully fund.
- For professional development, we decided to fund fully at $1500.
- We decided to fully fund their whole request for $36,476.

Native American Student Programs
Jon Cassell: They requested a new position but as a subcommittee we decided not to fund .
- We decided to fully fund the student assistance at $23,040.
- The Native American liaison goes to different tribes around the Riverside area and exposes students to different tribes and cultures. We decided to fund fully.
- For their NASP programming, we decided to cut $3000 from to reflect last year's amount. They didn't add anything else from last year.
- General operating costs had an $8500 increase and we decided to the same as last year We felt that $8500 without and explanation was a big jump.
- The travel professional development was mixed with the liaison and they already have a travel budget of about $33,000 dollars in permanent funds so we decided to not fund because it's lower on the priority list.
- We felt office supplies were needed and decided to fully fund .
- We decided to fully fund the mentorship and the collaborative programming. Having a mentor can connect with students and provide them with support. Any support we feel is necessary.
- Out of the $134,000 requested, we decided to fund $44,962.
Nafi Karim: If we made reductions we would go by priorities.

Dean of Students
Jon Cassell: Compared to last year's request, this year's request is much lower at $29,000.
- We decided to continue to fully fund their student assistants which was lower than last year's.
- For the common ground initiative facilitators, we decided to fully fund.
- Priority 3 is the Common Ground retreat; we decided to recommend funding this so that as a committee we can all review it as a whole. It's a retreat for a few students for a more in depth program on how to find yourself and where you fit in.
Nafi Karim: In their presentation they stressed that a lot of new ideas came out of those retreats. If we need to make reductions we would go by priority and that is the last priority.
Alex Taliaferro: It's already occurring without our funding.
Sean Fahmian: Why did they decrease the amount for the Common Ground facilitators?
Susana Salazar: I think the difference is the fact that last year the Dean of Students and Health and Wellness were combined.
Sue Lillie: The admin specialist is not there anymore and that's a big drop.

7) Administrative Issues
Alex Taliaferro: Please follow up with all these departments. We will be voting on all these line items next week.

8) Adjourn **5:51 PM**
Motion to Adjourn by Sean Fahmian, Second by Iris Jiang.
Vote: Yes: 8, No: 0, Abstain: 1.
Adjournment Approved Unanimously.