

Graduate and Family Housing (GFH) Advisory Committee | MINUTES

Meeting date | time 1/27/2020 3:00 PM

Meeting location: Barrett Room, HDH Admin Building

| | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|
| Type of meeting: | GFH Advisory Committee | Attendees: | |
| Co-Chairs: | Jana Severson Rachel Flannagan (interim) | Burgundy Fletcher Viona Deconinck Adriana Tosun Sven Bruggemann Gabriel Ascui Valerie Saiag Marybeth Ward Hana Haddad Burton Ober Rebecca Otten Malia Mahi Chris Dayss Michael Salas | |
| Note taker: | Tricia McKenzie (Secretary) | | |

Seeing quorum met, Jana began the meeting at approximately 3:10 PM by leading introductions of all attendees and going over the agenda.

AGENDA

Agenda Items:

1. GFH Overview – Training/Presentation
2. Offer Process – Training/Presentation
3. Occupancy
4. Budget Spreadsheet
5. Appeal – Discussion & Voting
6. Bylaws

Comments:

- Burgundy motioned to amend the agenda order by discussing items 5 (Appeals) and 6 (Bylaws) first and adding 10 minutes to discuss the Xpera Housing Study.
 - Motion seconded by Marybeth.
- Jana commented that the agenda was at the allotted time of 90 minutes and would prefer not to push anything from today's agenda as trainings/presentations are related to upcoming budget discussions with the committee. Jana expressed concern at the amount of time spent on appeals in the meeting prior and the number of agenda items leftover from the 1/13/20 meeting.
- Rachel proposed 5 minutes to discuss the Housing Study and any remaining time allotted for appeals would be added to the Housing Study Discussion.
- Burgundy and other members approved and agenda order was amended.

Appeals

Hana commented that the “queue” does not function on the appeals system as it should. When logging on members must search through all appeals for those pending rather than having them queued up for review upon login. Burgundy asked if there was a glitch or error with the system.

- Tricia responded that they are in current conversations with IT to resolve the pending request to grant ex-officio members viewing access and was aware that there was no queue for them either. Tricia to follow up with IT to make the request for a functioning queue to view Appeals pending vote.

Appeal # 1654

- Marybeth motioned to vote to deny the appeal.
 - Burton seconded the motion.
 - Sven objected and asked for additional information.
 - Rachel called for a vote on Marybeth’s motion to deny the appeal.
 - Approve: 3, Denied: 5, Abstained: 0
 - Decision: Motion denied to deny the appeal.

Rachel clarified Robert’s Rules moving forward for voting explaining that when a motion is made, member can approve the motion or deny. If denied, this is the time for additional discussion and alternative motions from committee members. motion.

- Burgundy motioned to grant the resident to stay in current housing through 6/30/2021.
 - Hana seconded. Motion carried with no objections.

Bylaws

Jana asked for approval for the proposed bylaws provided to members at the previous meeting on 1/13/20.

- Hana stated a concern that online voting could render a decision with 2/3 majority even if a member elected to defer discussion to the next meeting. Hana expressed the value of in-person discussions and would like see that if any member votes to defer an appeal to discuss at the meeting that they pend voting until the in-person meeting.
- Burgundy expressed support of Hana’s statement and confirmed the value of in-person discussion among committee members.

Burton asked how effective the comments section of the online appeals system is and how it is utilized.

- Hana commented that they typically vote after reading the appeal themselves and may not see comments come through. Hana does not see the comments being widely utilized.
- Jana commented that the appeals comments section was built into the system per request from voting committee members. Jana also asked for a commitment from the committee to review appeals online and vote when they felt comfortable doing so in order that every appeal would not automatically be forwarded to discussion and have a delayed response for residents.

Rachel stated that her understanding of the language in the current bylaws supports Hana’s statement. If a 2/3 majority vote is not reached online or a member votes to defer to the meeting, the appeal will be discussed at the next scheduled GFHAC meeting. Rachel asked for a motion to approve the proposed bylaws.

- Marybeth motioned to approve bylaws.
 - Burton seconded the motion. Bylaws approved with no objections. Jana to make final edits and document to be uploaded to the Box database.

Xpera Graduate Student Housing Study Discussion

Burgundy commented that the housing study did not appear to be unbiased or found to be an accurate representation of graduate students at UCSD. Burgundy commented that the person who conducted the study was a former staff member with previous ties to the university. Burgundy did not believe that this qualified as third party and Sven agreed.

Sven asked who decided to contract the company for the housing study.

- Jana replied that the selection was made by committee led by Campus Real Estate.
- Rachel added that they, along with the previous GSA president, met with the CFO and Dean of Grad Division, Hemlata, and Campus Real Estate. As a small committee, they received two proposals after Campus Real Estate completed marketing and ultimately the committee selected the proposal located in San Diego. Rachel noted that not everyone on the committee was aware of the conflict of interest.

Hana asked where to locate the study.

- The study is linked on the HDH GFH website under Resident Resources:
https://hdh.ucsd.edu/arch/docs/XPERA_Graduate_Student_Housing_Study_Report.pdf

Gabriel asked in what capacity the housing study would be used.

- Burgundy replied that the Chancellor uses the housing study to justify that HDH housing prices are 20% below market rate. Burgundy expressed that prices are below La Jolla market rate, not San Diego as a whole.
- Burton commented that they believed the study would have an influence on the rate structure.

Gabriel motioned not to use the housing study report as a reference due to conflict of interest.

- Burgundy seconded the motion.
- Sven added that the study should not be used in future discussions of rates.

Jana asked Rachel if the motion fell under the charge of the committee. Rachel confirmed that they believed it fell under the task “to review and make recommendations to the VC/CFO and Executive Director of HDH on current and prospective policies, levels of service, budgets and rate structures GFH communities.”

Rachel called to clarify the language for Gabriel’s motion.

- The motion is to not use the Xpera Housing Study report during the execution of the GFH Advisory Committee’s tasks due to conflict of interest and lack of representation of graduate students.
 - The motion carried with no objections.

Graduate and Family Housing Overview (Malia Mahi)

Malia Mahi presented a general overview of Graduate and Family Housing communities and services provided. Presentation to be made available to committee members through Box database following meeting.

- Viona asked how many total grad students there are.
 - Rebecca answered 7,942 total graduate students in Fall 2019.
- Burgundy asked if GFH would be adding CAPS and Food Pantry.
 - Jana confirmed CAPS offices are included in Nuevo West and there are discussions with collaborating for Food Pantry in GFH communities. A suggested location is at OMS, however, discussions are continuing with campus partners and not yet finalized.

Centralized Leasing - Offer Process (Michael Salas)

Michael Salas presented on the application and offer process for the Centralized Leasing Team. Presentation to be made available to committee members through Box database following meeting.

Sven asked for clarification on number of apartments occupied at Nuevo West and East at this time.

- Michael replied that for Nuevo East – no offers have been made yet as they open in July 2020; Nuevo West has occupied just over 200 spaces. Michael added that they expect to see a steady increase up to summer time.

- Chris added that this was accounted for in their planning – full occupancy was not anticipated at this time of the year.

Sven asked about the current plans for transitioning Rita to undergraduate students.

- Rita will have a 2 phased exit rather than a hard end-date. Residents with fixed terms that end roughly near June 2020 will move out at the end of their rental agreement. Residents with month-to-month agreements can stay through Summer of 2021. Come Fall 2020, the community would be mixed use with some undergraduate and graduate students living together until all graduate students exit.

Sven asked if the two-track exit was presented to the committee previously or communicated to the community.

- Jana replied that the two-track phase out was developed bearing in mind feedback provided by the GFH Advisory Committee. Jana stated that when they had communication ready to go out to Rita community members regarding the turnover, the communication will be brought to the committee as well.

Viona asked about ISPO adding as priority along with families and priority programs (SHORE, SOP, SOM) as it was a challenge for international students to navigate finding housing off-campus without credit scores, etc.

- Rachel and Jana noted to add this as an agenda item for future meeting as time was not allotted in today's agenda.

Overview of Budget Spreadsheet (Rebecca Otten)

Rebecca Otten shared a brief overview of the budget that will be used for the upcoming discussions. At the next GFHAC meeting, current year and two years out numbers will be populated. The goal is to have two year-rates mapped out – this is something that they've completed with the committee in the past. HDH is asking for GFHAC's feedback for how to generate revenue. Housing will present our expenses and needed revenue as well as a proposed distribution of rents.

- Adriana asked for clarification on the category of other campus housing expenses.
 - Rebecca replied that there are funds paid that go back to the university for services such as transportation, EH&S, UC Police Department, etc.
- Sven asked if they would have influence over other areas of spending as well.
 - Jana commented that there are some areas where there is not room for changes (example: salaries contracted by unions are set and are not open for committee discussion)
- Burgundy asked what parts of the picture we do see, will see, and where we have some influence.
 - Rebecca shared that this would be the topic of discussion in future meetings. Rebecca shared an example of GFH offices extending office hours to 9pm and being open on weekends. This service comes at a cost. If the committee does not feel that it's a worthwhile cost, this is an example of where there can be some influence on distribution of spending.

Final remarks:

Not enough time remaining for Occupancy presentation, this will be pushed to next meeting. Jana commented that at the meeting budget discussions will begin with a need to complete discussions with the committee by end of March.

Meeting adjourned around 4:35PM. Next meeting scheduled for 2/10/2020 at 3:00PM.