

**SFAC Winter Meeting #7**  
**2/20/15 11:00AM-1:00PM**  
**PC West Bear Room**

**Call to Order**

**Present:** Paul Tchir, Jackie Markt-Maloney, Prasad Radhakrishna, Mihiri Ukuwela, Ellen Kim, Andrew Thai, Mukanth Vaidyanathan, Jennifer Huerta, Norienne Saign, Ivan Evans, John Hughes, Paola Badilla

**Absent:** Ashraf Ramzy Beshay, Darlene Nguyen, Akshay Tangutur, William McCarroll, Sylvia Lepe-Askari

**Approval of Minutes from Meeting #4:** Motion to approve by Andrew, second by Ellen

**Approval of Minutes from Meeting #5:** Motion to approve by Mihiri, second by Prasad

**Review of representative presentation**

1. In the past we've had a strict standard of criteria regarding discussions with a small amount of area left for flexibility
  - a. This year - What criteria? How informally do we want to start discussion?
2. How do we want to approach this year?
  - a. Identifying campus goals, student affairs strategic goals, diversity scores, etc.
    - i. Score them on a numbered scale for certain criteria that we look for, such as its value to the student experience
3. What is SFAC?
  - a. Basic idea we need to convey – what exactly do we do? We need to make this clear and coherent for our councils
4. Literal/Implied/Pragmatic Purpose
  - a. Literal – brief discussion, no more than 30 seconds
  - b. Implied – there's a lot of things we can and should be doing, our most important task is advising the VCSA for priorities
    - i. The core of what we do and what we want to focus on → we are not just an allocative body. "We do much more than allocate, we become experts on the student fees"
  - c. Pragmatic – "We're here to discuss the pragmatic meaning"
5. History
  - a. We're undergoing a transformation as a body as the circumstances themselves change.
6. What's going on now?
  - a. Summarize the idea that the VCSA is coming to us with a pre-approved selection of proposals and budgetary adjustments
    - i. Avoid using "cuts" – it's not just a euphemistic pleasantry, it makes our statements more accurate
  - b. The idea that we're not just giving money now, we're trying to look at everything and look at where student priorities meld and how we can incorporate them into what you're already doing now. Emphasize the idea that we're an allocative body
7. Units

- a. Briefly go over units – they don't need to know what every unit does, just hope that they're able to recognize a few of them so they have an idea regarding units and what they do
- 8. The Problem
  - a. Because of decentralization, it's hard to keep the students educated and impacted
  - b. Spring quarter will be a public relations campaign
- 9. What's going on now? Pt. 3
  - a. We'll be returning in spring to update them and provide a more systematic approach of collecting student input
  - b. "What are student concerns that we should include in our recommendations to the VCSA?"
  - c. Show that you're willing to look for and take in critical information and trying to get a better sense of the student need
  - d. How we want to collect the information is up to you. You can take informal notes, receive emails, etc.
    - i. The survey last year was great, but it was also overwhelming
- 10. Questions, changes, items of concern?
  - a. Mukanth: Asking for SFAC reports regarding GSA from last year to provide background on why things were supported, etc.
  - b. Prasad: What do we convey during the pragmatic purpose slide?
    - i. We're highlighting to them that it's very confusing, and asking what you actually want us to do with that information. That's what we're here to discuss.
  - c. Ashraf: Is the list of the units a complete list? Recommend showing the complete list so that they can see everything that we're considering.
    - i. It's just a list of the units that receive the most funding. Page 41/42 in our binders has a complete list of units

### Consideration of criteria for guiding our recommendations

- 1. Core funds - from student fees
- 2. Non-core funds – revenue, gift, specific purpose
- 3. VCSA is 50% core/50% non-core regarding these funds
  - a. Of its 50% core, 25% comes for the Student Services Fee
  - b. Up to about 3 years ago, the whole of the SSF had shifted into the complete funding of VCSA
- 4. Non-divisional requests
  - a. Will be effective 2015-16, will be moving out of the VCSA "bubble"
- 5. \$31 million of "core funds"
  - a. 50% goes to the VCSA, which is distributed across different organizations that have "single digit percentages" of this money
  - b. Usually end up spending \$29 million of the "core funds" budget because we follow a personal budget model that emphasizes spending less than your budget
    - i. Eventually this led to \$15 million in reserves
  - c. Ended up spending more than our "core funds" budget, with averages of \$34 million of overexpenditure in efforts to balance the \$15 million reserves

6. Using this method until the reserves meet 5% of our entire \$31 million budget
  - a. By 2024/25, we want to accomplish this 5% goal
  - b. Because we overextended at \$3 million, it puts us at 0% at roughly the 2018/20 years.
    - i. We need to make a \$3 million cut to save the budget from hitting that mark – we have to make it no matter what.
    - ii. To do this, looking at 2% reductions per year, roughly adding up to 10% at the 5 year mark
7. 2015/16
  - a. Outside the division, we're asking them to participate in this "gamble" that whatever you're doing is impacting the students as much as somebody else – this means someone loses their "anti" if they don't affect students as much as others
8. What groups are we looking at?
  - a. Student retention, Success, Persistence – Undergrad research, OASIS, Mentor/Mentee
  - b. Recruitment, access, admission, yield – Summer Bridge
  - c. Student safety and well-being – BCAL, EIP, Drugs/Alcohol, Free Programming
  - d. The 4<sup>th</sup> group? This is where students are important – is there a 4<sup>th</sup> grouping based on student needs and input?
  - e. Shifting the campus budget model to a discussion based model – Pierre Ouillet
  - f. Alternative? Get the campus to provide that \$3 million gap
9. If we answered all of the "asks" on the wish list, we would spend a total of \$5.6 million
  - a. Blue highlighted requests in our packet have high chances of getting into our budget.
10. Admissions – part of the core-funded model but isn't part of the SSF
  - a. Recruitment and yield – core funded, but not SSF
11. Going back to the 2% - how do we get it back if the campus doesn't support us
  - a. If we asked all of the departments to give 2% of their own tiny slices, it wouldn't be strategic
  - b. Rather, asked for 4% realignments that would take the focus off programs that aren't as important and focusing on those that are more relevant
    - i. Unpopular with the departments – but it's purpose is to demonstrate that we're spending \$3 million more than we have on positive things
    - ii. Over the next 5 years, rather than cutting 10% in one year, maybe 2-3% per year
  - c. We need the students to start weighing in on the "wants" side – discussing what we don't and do like – What's important to the students and what is it that we value?
12. Paul: Worried about this idea of the "asks" that did not make it past the pre-approved list Does this list now represent everything that's coming in on the table now that we've approached a more informal approach?
  - a. At some point the campus is going to provide some dollar amount for what we've discussed and presented – what we do with the money is the implementation side
    - i. Diverting money proportionally into the different areas that we want to focus on

- b. The lever that we're developing to get more resources from campus in the name of the student experience
  - c. When we have the realignment list, it will have a chilling effect
    - i. i.e. – Athletics need .5 FTE to address their new scholarship model – all this needed was a redirection of FTE's from a different area and saying yes, they can help another department
  - d. Is there another 4<sup>th</sup> group to add in addition to admissions, student retention, etc.
  - e. The reserves will be depleted in roughly 5 years; realistically we can make it to 2019/20 before we're at absolute 0.
13. Paul: In regards to the blue highlighted items by the VCSA, can we assume that they will be funded by the VCSA regardless, or should we still be focusing on them? Will it simply be a waste of our time?
- a. Can we look at these items line by line? We can, but if we do it before we identify what we're trying to accomplish, it'll pose a problem. Recommendation is to look at what we want to accomplish, then go line by line and say that yes, they are in accordance to our goals
14. Communities of different populations
- a. Lots of crossover – one of the themes is that we need funds to manage the needs of these separate communities, but members of this community would cross over into other communities
  - b. Special populations in high-risk student populations – expensive to manage effectively
15. Because of our physical location of the campus, campus life may suffer – UCSD centric
16. Campus culture – i.e. the Guardian will fit under campus culture
- c. Student retention isn't reflective of campus culture and how it has developed
  - d. Many things haven't plugged into campus life (which was once up there) but they didn't apply to these high-risk populations
17. Ivan: "Other contributions" – who makes these contributions and are they locked in/discretionary?
- e. Partnering with non-core partners to help participate
    - i. i.e. Health sciences might contribute some funds to BCAL
  - f. Working across organizational lines – these contributions aren't locked in, it's a model/wishlist to look at partnerships across the board

## Adjournment

**Present:** Paul Tchir, Jackie Markt-Maloney, Prasad Radhakrishna, Mihiri Ukuwela, Andrew Thai, Ashraf Ramzy Beshay, Darlene Nguyen, Akshay Tangutur, Mukanth Vaidyanathan, Jennifer Huerta, Norienne Saign, Ivan Evans, John Hughes

**Absent:** Ellen Kim, William McCarroll, Sylvia Lepe-Askari