

Student Fee Advisory Committee

February 26 2016

Meeting Minutes

Present: Sherwynn Umali, Alexander Li, Matthew Tsai, Kim Sadler, Haruka Hatori, Chance Pardon, Tim Ma (for John Alejandro), Liuyi Pei, Valerie Sanchez, Parshan Khosravi, Kristine Jermakian

Absent: Felicia Martinez

Guests: Provost-EVC Enrique Lavernia, Vice Chancellor Meredith Michaels

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

1. Budget Information and Funding Requests
 - a. The committee will need to break into subcommittees to review requests and provide feedback and begin ranking requests.
 - b. Next Fridays meeting will be an informal meeting and the subcommittees should use the time to work on reviewing their assigned budget submissions.

2. Visit With Provost-EVC Lavernia and VC Michaels
 - a. Introductions
 - b. Matt provided the Provost with an update on committee's activities to date:
 - i. The committee launched the annual SFAC Student Fee Survey and started a multicultural outreach effort.
 - ii. The committee has reviewed and provided recommendations on the 2016-17 Course Materials and Services Fee proposals.
 - iii. The committee has reviewed and provided feedback on the proposed spring 2016 student fee referenda.
 - iv. Currently, the committee is reviewing budget information and funding requests from SSF-funded units and will provide the Provost with funding recommendations during the spring quarter.
 - c. Discussion with the Provost
 - i. What are the Provost's expectations of the committee? How does the Provost envision SFAC moving forward?
 1. The Provost does support a more active SFAC presence on the campus and it is important to keep in mind how the committee can impact students now and in the future.
 2. We have moved to place in higher education where state-campuses are more on our own. It will be challenging, but will also allow institutions, including students to set priorities for the campus. It's important to help students, with extra investment from all partners, including students, to make student life better in the long term.
 3. UCI is a bit of a secret to a lot of people. The campus is young, but UCI has an opportunity to define the student experience in order to make the

campus to attractive to potential and current students. We have a good framework in place.

- ii. Would the Provost like the committee to be more active in interacting with students and have a larger presence on the campus?
 1. It's probably difficult to reach students (it's hard for me to reach faculty), but any sort of personal outreach is good because you want to hear from the most number of people. Surveys may be biased and may polarize people, so yes the more outreach you can do to get people engaged to provide feedback, the better information and the more varied the information.
- iii. Are there a segment of the students who are not responding to the survey?
 1. There seems to be a lower response rate from those who identify as African American or black in proportion to those who identify in these categories at UCI, particularly graduate students. There is a chance that their voices in a sense become unheard because other voices drown them out.
 2. We've been discussing ways that we can get more feedback outside of the survey.
 3. Provost suggestion: You could touch bases with Vice Provost Judy Stepan-Norris and Doug Haines (Vice Provost for Academic Equity, Diversity and Inclusion), who think about surveying attitudes and how groups react to surveys and we might be able to learn how to be more efficient and effective. Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Thomas Parham may also have some ideas. His background/training in psychology could be helpful.
 4. We (the committee) haven't done enough analysis, but significantly smaller and disproportionate amount of minorities have not responded and even though some of the services are geared towards them, they still have not responded.
- iv. What is the Provost's vision for UCI? Where do we fit in and what can we offer students that other UCs don't have?
 1. We now have a VC of Communications tasked with creating an identity for the campus.
 2. This campus does things differently from some of the other UCs. The type of interdisciplinary research that benefits both the real world and academia (the Social Ecology discipline was invented here). Our DNA is not to scream about what we do well here and we need to be more deliberate in communicating to the outside about what UCI does. Let us make sure the world knows what we are doing. No stamp gives us an opportunity to create one.
 3. On Monday, the Chancellor and Provost will release the campus strategic plan--a guiding document for both the campus and outside world to know what UCI's plan is for the future.
 4. We have work to do, but we are very energized and Chancellor Gillman has a great vision for the campus that excites a lot of people.

5. We need to make sure students really want to come here and have a great experience while they are here.
- v. How do you envision student life/experience?
 1. Student experience is absolutely one of the four pillars of the campus strategic plan: We want to make UCI the school of choice and enhance students' quality of life. In order to do this all stakeholders will need to partner in providing resources.
- vi. We are coming up with metrics. We have a great plan, but how are we doing every year? It's (the strategic plan) a living document to guide us to see if we are really changing every year and what needs attention.
- vii. The earlier strategic plan adopted by the campus around 2005 focused on growth. There is a fundamental difference between the current strategic plan and the previous one. The current strategic plan still focuses on growth, but growth where it will make a difference. Let's see what our identity is and how do we make a difference, but do it smartly.
- viii. In order for departments to meet the goals of the strategic plan, they will have to shift resources to where there will be more financial opportunities.
- ix. We need to develop an economically sustainable model and have the entire community understand the metrics we want to get to, what resources we have, what additional resources we will need. We have taken ownership of the goals, and identify resources. Also from the administration's point of view, what can we do better? We will need better investment in staff and other resources. One of the resources we can tap is that UCI is the only R1 institution in Orange County, and the community is finally starting to get engaged and that means providing resources. Here are our ambitions, we need to partner with the community and to bring in the resources.

3. February 19, 2016 meeting minutes approved.

4. Update on Campus-Based Fee Referenda

a. AGS voted on three referenda

- i. The Food Pantry passed unanimously, but WHC building and the Student Center referenda did not pass.
- ii. AGS will entertain a motion to reconsider. Even if an emergency meeting is called, AGS may not be able to reconsider because grad students might not be able to come back for the meeting.
- iii. AGS would like to see the Student Center audit results.
- iv. The WHC referendum may get on the ballot under three other circumstances if AGS does not approve the referendum getting on the ballot:
 1. If there is a petition, and they get enough signatures (it will take 8% of students to sign the petition in order to get the referendum on the ballot).
 2. If undergraduates vote and over 25% of total student body votes on it (33% of undergraduates) and 60% of those voting vote yes, then graduate students will still have to pay the fee.

3. If all of that fails, the chancellor can institute a fee.
- v. Why did the AGS Council not support the WHC referenda? What are the issues?
 1. This is a lot of money.
 2. Why are students paying for capital debt? It is unfair for students to pay for constructing a building. It hasn't been done very often.
 3. There is no sunset clause; it is essentially saying that it would not end.
 4. Need a better budgetary breakdown of how funds will be spent.
 5. The AGS Council didn't want to fund speculation by the UC system when they refinance debt. They wanted some sort of guarantee for how long students will have to pay the fee, especially since this is something that today's student would not have to pay. The referendum made no guarantee on how long students will have pay the fee. It's extremely hard to convince students that students should pay indefinitely for a construction project.
 6. With the Student Center, it was more about accountability; there was a \$2M mistake, and if you can't tell how it happened how you can prevent it from happening again?
 7. The Student Center is doing a good job of budgeting; but the current staff is paying for the mistakes of past staff.
 8. Student Center catering is extremely expensive; even if they levy fee to maintain current services, catering has already out priced student organization budgets.
 9. The Student Center doesn't get much help from other campus departments; operations are not being funded to the level they need to be. Other budget impacts include: funding not being adjusted for CPI, insources of workers, labor union contracts.
 10. Propose to waive campus assessments until operating budget issues are resolved.

b. ASUCI Legislative Council

- i. Alvin wanted to withdraw support for Student Center, but it will be sent back to Legislative Council for reconsideration.
- ii. WHC building
 1. ASUCI concerns were similar in nature to AGS concerns.
 - a. The language needs to include a sunset clause. Students want to see the year the fee will end.
 - b. A building advisory board is mandated by UCOP policy; even if it is not in the ballot language, it will be a requirement.
- iii. Food pantry passed.
- iv. Next week, other ballots will be discussed on Tuesday, except Media referendum will be discussed on Thursday.

5. CSF Update

- a. The committee will table update on CSF winter quarter meeting (Alvin and Parshan could not be at today's meeting).

b. The next CSF meeting will be during is week five of the spring quarter.

6. Meeting adjourned.