

Student Service Fee Advisory Committee
 Friday, May 2, 2014; 3:00 to 6:00 PM
 HUB Room 355

Name	Association	Voting Privilege ¹	Attendance
Cardenas. Lazaro	ASUCR	X	L
Cassell, Jon [Alternate]	ASUCR	X	P
Dow, Liam	ASUCR	X	L
Hong, Ashley	ASUCR	X	A
Eckman, Cathy	Interim CFAO, Ex-Officio, VCSA	-	P
Salazar, Susana	Ex-Officio-RP&B	-	P
Taliaferro, Alexander	ASUCR	X	P
Tang, Janice	ASUCR	X	L
Ta, Johnny	ASUCR	X	P
Fahmian, Sean	ASUCR	X	P
Polishko, Anton	GSA	X	L
Stewart, Terrance	GSA	X	L
Lucas, Keira	GSA	X	P
Alvarez, Luis	Staff	X	A
Sedita, Jolene	Staff	X	P
Sanchez Martinez, Veronica	Secretary	-	X
Lillie, Sue	Staff Support	-	X
Guests			

P – Present A – Absent L – Late Exc. – Excused

¹ X - indicates voting privilege

1. **Welcome Time:** 3:19 PM

2. **Approve Agenda:**

MOTION: Sean Fahmian/ Alex Taliaferro	VOTE: 6/0/0-unanimous
--	------------------------------

3. **Approve Meeting Minutes:**

MOTION: Sean Fahmian/Jon Cassell	VOTE: 6/0/1-motion carries
---	-----------------------------------

4. **Subcommittee Review:**

- **Liam:** We have to go back to subcommittee C because the Referendum did not pass.

a. **Subcommittee C (Luis, Jolene, and Johnny):**

- **African Student Program(ASP):**

▪ **Not Funding Priority 7-10:**

- **Mail service:** We believe it is a standard functioning of the department that we felt it was not necessary for us to fund it. In Gender departments we do not fund mail services.
- Cathy- Mail services on campus are for pickup and delivery of the mail, there is an ongoing fee every month. This also includes notices to students announcing their events, conferences, etc. The departments are charged for these services.
- They are asking for the highest request of \$3, 000 for mail services, unlike other departments who are asking for less money. The lowest request was of \$1,500 from the LGBT program. It is based on the mail activity to see who gets more funding. The bigger departments like Student Life have a huge mail service bill.
- Lazaro- It is good to take into consideration that it is important for the departments to advertise their events to the community by mail services.
- It would be a good idea to allocate \$1,500 for the mail services and if they need more money they can come back and appeal.
- **Annual Welcome:** We made our decision based on the amount of people that they cater to and the amount that they are asking for because it is one of their largest events, but the amount of people it benefits is minimal.
- **Professional Development and Travel:** We also did not fund it because of the lack of information and we did not think it is crucial for the program.

- **Collaborative Programing Funds:** All the departments asked for collaborative funds, but we decided not to fund for collaborative programing to all the Ethnic/Gender programs.
- They are funded \$168,000 permanent, but they do not have any general funds.
- **Recommendation #1:** Administration Assistant-Funding for the position.
- **Recommendation #2:** Fund Four Student Assistant-It is important because it gives students job opportunities. Last year they wanted 7 student assistants, but we decided to fund only four student assistants to work 48 hours per week. Last year they had an ongoing funding of s \$3,000 and they only had two assistants. Their request for this year is \$20,160.
- **Recommendation #3:** ABC Conference- Fund it.
- **Recommendation #4:** Black History Month-VCSA funds them sometimes, but they have to request it. Last year we did not fund.
- **Recommendation #5:** Funding Background Checks- Recommendation was funding \$1,175.
- **Fund \$35, 411 to African Student Program.**

MOTION: Sean Fahmian/Lazaro Cardenas	VOTE: 7/0/0-motion carries
---	-----------------------------------

- **Asian Pacific Student Program (APSP)**
 - Overall they asked for a very small request. They service about 10,000 students on campus. In terms of recommendations, we recommended funding their **priority #1**, which would be the **student assistants** and that was continuing temporary funding from last year. The assistants would work in the front desk.
 - We decided to combine phones, mail services, and photocopiers expenses. We gave them a block of \$1, 500.
 - We recommend the full amount of \$7,600 for programming funds.
 - All the departments are requesting for collaborative funding. This is money that they are currently receiving from other departments. We decided not to fund priority #8.
 - **Recommendation#1:** We established student staffing, and employee benefits.
 - **Recommendation#2:** Finger printing and Background Checks similar to peer mentoring combine priorities 3, 4 and 5 was a great idea.

Allocate \$21, 698 to Asian Student Pacific Program.

MOTION: Johnny Ta/Lazaro Cardenas	VOTE: 7/0/0-motion carries
--	-----------------------------------

- **Conversation Regarding the Director of CSP**

- Johnny: It comes to my attention that there are a few comments made by the Director of CSP Estella Acuna. She undermined the voice of students during elections by saying “this is cute, they think this is real.” To me that kind of undermined the entire purpose of student advocacy and student voice. That kind of concerns me when she is coming to SSFAC requesting for funds. There are a lot of leaders here who represent a large portion of the student body.
 - Lazaro: I think that is an unfortunate comment that she made, or she might have not made because she is not here to defend herself. We can have a long discussion regarding SSFAC autonomy regarding student elections and how we revolve around that. ASUCR organization elections are completely separate from our process. It was a very personal opinion. A personal comment should not dictate how we move forward with the allocations of these funds, maybe that’s a conversation we can have with her and have student leaders talk to her about that.
 - Kiera: That is not a reason why we should penalize CSP.
 - Liam: Let’s focus on getting through this process and maybe we can have a conversation with the Vice Chair to find a way to address the issue.
- **Chicano Student Program (CSP)**
 - **Jolene:** They estimate the 12 member students served to be 17,252. They had quite a large budget request this year because they are asking for a new staff position.
 - Their first priority was their student assistants. That is continuing ongoing temporary fund that we have been giving them the past three years. We felt that the assistants are absolutely important because they work the front desk and do other events. The number of students that they serve is quite similar in term of percentage wise with APSP. APSP has a Director plus two additional support staff in terms of student affairs officers. Right now CSP only has the Director plus one. We did feel that given the amount of students that they serve they should have extra support on hand.
 - We recommended **funding a new Staff position.**
 - We recommended funding for their background checks for their student employees. Actually we did not background checks, we decided to fund only for the student assistants, the student affairs officer and the programming funds which is of \$15,000.
 - We recommended \$96,175 of their additional request.
 - CSP has John and Arlene. John is the assistant administration person who is shared between three other offices. He does the process of payroll, reimbursement, and setting up reservations for the rooms. He is funded completely under CSP. John cannot do programming. Arlene is the only SAO II they have. They have permanent funding for the three positions.
 - APSP has two SAO, while CSP only has one SAO. APSP serves about the same amount of students. APSP has two programming coordinator or SAO II and one Director and the Administrative Assistant. That would be John in CSP and I know John does a lot of work with CSP. He is also shared with the Middle Eastern Student Center as well. In terms of an actual program coordinator CSP only has one person.
 - John is fully funded by CSP, and the other programs that he works for do not fund him.
 - Lazaro: I think it’s a really important topic because last year when we talked about positions, we had allocated a position for the LGBT. It’s kind of tough to give folks

another temporary position as much as we would like to, unfortunately the referendum did not pass. It's tough giving them this temporary position and then they are going to get used to it and next year we might not be able to fund them.

- Liam: I don't agree with funding the position.
- Lazaro: We have LGBT, CSP and Native Americans are asking for another position. We should hold that item for across the board. We did fund one temporary fund position last year and they knew it was only one year. It would be a nice idea to rotate that funding to each department based on their needs. Who are we going to give the funding for the position to?
- CSP has \$165,000 Permanent SSF and a little bit of foundation money. CSP is a little behind because they do not have the additional program coordinator.
- APSP has about \$214, 000 in permanent funding. CSP has \$165, 000.
- New position: They want to do more outreach with their social media because they do not have a social media person.
- Last year CSP received \$16, 973 in temporary ongoing funding and a block allocation of \$20,000 for everything.
- Sean: For student positions they are asking for \$18,000 plus their programming that is probably the same amount that they put in programing and a new position that is what does not add up to me. As far as the social media students are really good with social media. They are asking for the same amount for programming as last year so I do not see why they need another programming coordinator.
- They also want a SAO II because they want to expand their relationship with housing, they would like to develop first year programs, develop a program for Latino male students, and develop a program for Undocumented AB40 students and a program for graduate students.
- There is an article that talks about the first time that Latinos suppress whites at UCs.
- Liam: At this moment it is really hard for the committee to fund this position.
- Alex: Rotating the funding around might not be efficient.
- Liam: When we see potion requests I don't want to look at them as temporary funding, I want us to look at them as permanent positions. We made a commitment for temp funding but if the committee absolutely wants to do a temp funding; we shouldn't look it as a temp position. Once we start with a position, every time they are reviewing this job, it seems unfair and unproductive.
- Terrance: VCSA Tech Services also requested a position to run the entire website within Costco hall.
- It is a conversation we can have on the board once subcommittee C finishes; we can talk about all the departments and bring it back to a larger conversation.
- #1- Student Assistants II – These are student positions that we should continue to fund.
- #2: Student Affairs Officer #1- New Position – Do not fund, table discussion.
- #3: Programing: They asked for \$15,000 for programming. They have their Chicano link peer mentoring, Inland Empire Scholars Program, radio Aztlan Music Festival, Speakers and film series that CSP hosts. Their graduate forum and student leadership development. They also have Day of the Dead event and Cesar Chavez 5K.
- APSP received more funding because they have an extra permanent position.

- Lazaro: I motion tabling the discussion for the new positions for all the other programming offices.
- **I motion to approve \$32, 971 to CSP, while tabling the discussion of the new position to later on this meeting.**

MOTION: Lazaro Cardenas/ Johnny TA	VOTE: 7/1/0-motion passes
------------------------------------	---------------------------

- **LGBT**

- They do not have a specific amount of students because this is an unknown population because not all the students feel comfortable with coming out.
- Recommendation#1: SAO I position: This position was funded last year with temporary funding. Nancy stressed this position as the only thing she wanted if nothing else could get funded.
- We are going to table for a larger discussion. We gave LGBT a onetime allocation the position. If the referendum had passed LGBT would not ask for more funding. We are going to fund for everything because they need the funding.
- Recommendation#2: Student Assistants: The staff does the office work throughout the day because they have a lot of students coming in and out. They have a lot of students who have questions about their resource center. We want to fund the full amount asked for.
- Recommendation#3: Graduate Student Intern stipend for the summer program they hold for the graduate students to actually come to UCR to get training to become a department head and get some experience in meeting students. We want to fund the full amount asked for.
- Recommendation#4: Programing funds: They are asking for \$5,000. It varies across different departments.
- Recommendation#5: Computing: They are asking for \$2,000. It is for programs licenses and also chats. The chats are completely anonymous where students can log on a computer to talk to the available RCC LGBT students where they can have a conversation about their sexual identity. It is important for success and outreach.
- Recommendation#6: Panic button: They requested for \$426. It is important because they receive a lot of threats and random calls. Subcommittee C made a good argument of the importance of the panic button.
- Jolene: Out of all the departments that we met with I felt that LGBT was the one that was collaborating with other Ethnic/ Gender programs. They participated in 365 events last year. LGBT serves the whole population, not just LGBT students.
- See bottom of page 8 for balance of LGBT request.
- **Fund \$12,522 to the LGBT Resource Center, while tabling the discussion of the SAO I position.**

MOTION: Alex Taliaferro/Sean Fahmian	VOTE: 8/0/0-motion carries
--------------------------------------	----------------------------

1. **Middle Eastern Program:**

- We recommended funding for all requests except the collaborative funding. They need to be given a chance to show what they could do.

- Recommendation #1: MEP is only requesting half of Marcela Ramirez salary because the other half is already covered. She has no student assistant. She makes her office work even though it is very small.
 - Permanent funding for half of her salary was given for SAOIII position and that was a decision made because as the department was developed, part of the rule for a new developing program was to have an activity coded. You need permanent funding to start a program. They received \$22,350 in salaries, and \$250 in S&E. Last year when we approved \$6,000, Jim came at the end and it was a rough decision. They did some type of swap maybe from central programming to get the activity moving. The position was allocated as a temporary fund last year. They received 50% FTE permanent funding as part of the appeal process. It was a decision made by the Chancellor to fund 50% FTE due to the requirement in the budgeting for a new department to have some kind of permanent funding- Susana's explanation.
 - Basically, a center gets \$5,000 for a permanent funding position every year. If it is a new position they get an addition of \$3,500 to set the person up so it is a total of \$8,500. The center should have never asked for 3,500 because it is not a new position. They are already setup. They are already receiving \$2,500 because they already got half of the \$5,000 for S&E. They are going to be funded \$2,500 permanent instead of \$3,500.
 - Liam: The other \$2,500 is already permanent funding. We should add \$1,000 to \$2,500 to keep consistency. They temporary funding is going to change to 1,000.
- Recommendation#2: Tina founded the Middle Eastern Program. The center depends on volunteers, but she wants a structure. It is not convenient to depend on volunteers because they do not get paid so they may not want to volunteer. She wants student that could make this a priority. Fund the student assistants \$8,996.
- Recommendation#3: Speakers and Film fees-The subcommittee recommended \$6,000. We should not group recommendation3, and 5 as was done last year.
- Recommendation#4: Fully fund.
- Recommendation#5: Fully fund.
- Recommendation#6: Collaborative Programing is not being funded.
- Recommendation#7: Fully fund.
- The total is \$56, 129 and this includes the half of the position
- Do we want to fund the other half permanently? Clarify the error and table the full position for clarification on what exactly happened.
- Liam: For now we are not going to fund the other half. Then we are going to have a conversation about permanently funding the other half.
- We are going to fund \$2, 500 permanent instead of 1,000 to keep consistency with the other departments.
- Cathy: Last year we used diversity permanent funding for Marcela's position. She was in that old position as a diversity coordinator and I believe we were able to use half of that to support her.
- Lazaro: Diversity is in Dean of Students so whether it was the Administrative Assistant or it was a Diversity Assistant, we did defund Diversity Initiatives to Administrative Assistant.

- Cathy: We had to look for a way to fund for the position.
- Liam: There is no more need for clarification.

Allocate \$32, 143 permanent and \$25,486 temporary funding.

MOTION: Sean Fahmian/Lazaro Cardenas	VOTE: 9/0/0-motion carries
---	-----------------------------------

2. Native American:

- #1 Priority for NASP Student Assistants-They are very important because Josh is absent most of the time travelling to make contact with global tribes. That is a big part of his work to create relationships with the Native tribes.
- #3 Priority NASP -Native Nations Liaison: It is basically for traveling that includes food. It helps create community support.
- #4 Priority for Programming- As the population increases they requested more programing. The \$5,000 for programing is adequate.
- NASP asked for a lot of funding because they have some major events that also involve the community.
- Lazaro: We should fund \$5,000 to \$6,000 for programming.
- Jolene: They have other funding.
- Mentorship is included in the student assistants. It is aimed at first and second years. They also outreach to the community to get Native Americans to UCR. Native Americans are the lowest population on campus. There are .5% (76 students), but they also provide services to other students on campus.
- We should take into consideration mail services and background checks because they deal with high school students to outreach to the community. We should add \$1,500 for the mail service.
- The background checks would be used for three students. They are important because it is used for paid and unpaid positions. Their mentorship program that outreaches to high schools need a background check to make sure that it is safe for them to work with minors.
- Get clarification on Background Check. For now allocate \$1, 000.
- **Motion to allocate \$29,727 to Native American Student Programs.**

MOTION: Lazaro Cardenas/ Sean Fahmian	VOTE: 9/0/0-motion carries
--	-----------------------------------

3. Subcommittee C:

- **LGBT:**
 - Lazaro: Sometimes departments feel that they are fighting over funds.
 - Jolene: They really need Sy Simms because he works at the front desk, he is in charge of programming, and manages crisis.
 - He is an existing position and he is necessary for the LGBT Resource Center.
 - **Fund SAO I at \$ 63, 984 for the LGBT Resource Center.**

MOTION: Johnny Ta/ Jolene Sedita	VOTE: 9/0/1-motion carries
---	-----------------------------------

- **CSP:**

- They have one Director, one SAO and an Administrative Assistant. They are all funded.
- It is a hard decision to make. The Latino population is growing, but we should not fund the position because they are going to expect us to fund them every year. Our current financial situation is not that good.
- It's tough decision to fund a position and then the other department will not get funded.
- **Motion to not fund the new position for CSP.**

MOTION: Alex Taliaferro/ Kiera Lucas	VOTE: 7/1/1-motion carries
---	-----------------------------------

4. Subcommittee D:

- **Student Life:**

- **Recommendation#1:** Student assistant position- They don't have workers for the whole 8 hours. They want student assistants to be at the front desk. Student Life has asked for \$50,000. It is not a crisis if there are no student assistants. We recommend funding for 48 hrs. a week with a salary of \$9.00 per hour.
- **Recommendation#2:** They are requesting \$2,000 for the commuter program to make the commuters feel welcome to campus. They provide food, stamps prizes for commuters.
- Terrance: They taught me the best route to drive the freeway. It was very useful for me.
- **Recommendation#3:** They also want \$2,000 for first year programs to have mentors. Recommend the full \$2,000.
- **Recommendation#4:** Highlander link is for sororities, fraternities to manage their members. Every student utilizes the program so it is very important.
- **Recommendation#5:** Funding for increasing involvement for sororities and fraternities Center Programming. They are asking for \$12,500. We have not funded them in the past, but they pay student services fee. We recommend fund them \$3,000 to see how they utilize the money.
- **Recommendation#6:** They are asking for 25% for an SAO III. In the past we gave temporary funding. They work with all the programs because all the departments have their own advisor.
 - Priority#1 is an existing position we should continue funding this position. We should not fund SAO III and during the appeal process they can come back and appeal.
- **Motion to temporary funding of \$ 100, 856 for Student Life.**

MOTION: Jolene Sedita/Janice Tang	VOTE: 9/0/1-motion carries
--	-----------------------------------

- **Announcement:** Next meeting will be on 05/06/14

5. Adjourn:

MOTION: Lazaro Cardenas/ Sean Fahmian	VOTE: 10/0/0-motion carries
--	------------------------------------

6. Adjournment: 5:55 PM