

## Student Fee Advisory Committee

October 24, 2011  
Meeting Minutes

Present: Justin Chung, Sandra Jones, Jason Lee, Johnson Liu, Vikram Nayudu, Clara Schultheiss, Aaron Tso, Jack Williams IV, Elaine Won

Absent: Patrick Le, Wonsup Hwang (proxy to Vikram Nayudu), Lowell Trott (proxy to Justin Chung), Chris Dunckle (proxy to Justin Chung)

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

- 1) Meeting called to order
- 2) Minutes from October 10, 2011 meeting approved.
- 3) Aaron Tso provided a CSF update for the committee:
  - a) CSF campaign #1: CSF will discuss the campus referendum process and campus-based fees in terms how referenda should be constructed and will establish principles/standing policy for referenda and campus-based fees.
  - b) CSF campaign #2: Create a Student Services Fee Enforcement group. Not all 10 SFACs operate the same, so there is a need for standardization of the committees (further clarification are included in the CSF minutes; Aaron will distribute the CSF minutes when they are received).
  - c) Berkeley will have an unofficial campaign to look at a student fee increase plan.
- 4) Update on 2010-11 SFAC recommendations:
  - a) Official allocation memos in the process of being approved; all EVCP advisors and interested parties providing feedback were supportive of the funding allocation recommendations and the EVCP usually follows their advice in this type of situation.
  - b) Funds should be transferred in time for the October 2011 general ledger.
  - c) The EVCP shared the committee's concerns and priorities (Career Center, Counseling Center and LARC) on budget reduction issues with DUE, Student Affairs and the Budget Work Group (BWG).
  - d) The Career Center was protected from 2011-12 budget reductions; there is currently a hiring freeze.
  - e) Student Affairs was asked by the EVCP to maintain Enrollment Services and student health and student mental health services as much as possible. Due to the size of the Student Affairs budget reduction (18%), Student Affairs was not able to completely protect the Counseling Center from the budget cut, but was able to minimize the reduction by eliminating one open provision funded at \$48,000 (which is about half the annual salary of one counselor). The \$48,000 is equivalent to about 2% of the Counseling Center budget, so the cut was disproportionately smaller than the cut Student Affairs as an organization received.

- f) A BWG subcommittee conducted a detailed study of LARC (some of this was shared at the end of the 2011 spring quarter with SFAC members who were able to attend a joint BWG subcommittee-SFAC meeting.) After reviewing LARC student service data and discussions with DUE and several school deans, the subcommittee found that a large number of students utilizing LARC services were mainly Physical Sciences and Biological Sciences students. Most of these students were not “at risk” students who needed tutoring in order to pass a class; many of these students were working to increase their grades from Bs to As and/or to increase their GPAs. The subcommittee, DUE and the deans felt that the schools could absorb some of these tutoring activities within their schools and that LARC should focus on core academic support in writing and study skills and preparation courses. Other non-core tutoring activities could be offered on a fee-for-service basis by LARC.
  - g) There has been a request by the Paul Merage School of Business for funding of ~\$57K to support a career services counselor in the school. The enrollments have been steadily increasing, but the campus Career Center does not have the capacity to provide additional services to Merage students. Since career counseling services (offered by the Career Center), was a committee priority, it would be of value for the committee to offer their recommendation on the request to the EVCP. A similar request was made via the SFAC budget review process, but it would have used up a large amount of the incremental funds the committee was making recommendations on and the committee wanted to make sure the school was not duplicating services offered by the Career Center.
  - h) Justin would like to have a better understanding of the funds SFAC has allocated and other Student Services Fee funds available for campus funding needs; what the levels of reserves are and the spending plan for the reserves; why there is fluctuation from year to year in the spending and appropriations of Student Services Fee funds; an understanding of how Student Services Fees funds are budgeted and allocated; how funds allocated in the past are being used (for the purposes they were originally intended); and what the impact of the budget reductions have been on funding that has been provided in the past for specific purposes.
  - i) The committee would like to have a meeting w/AVC Lynch, the SFAC chair and other interested committee members (see subcommittee discussion below) to discuss student fee budgets.
- 5) Feedback on eTech fee
- a) The next eTech meeting will be on 11/2.
  - b) Johnson would like to share with the eTech advisory committee SFAC members’ opinions on how eTech is used in each school and also provide feedback from students on their eTech needs.
  - c) The committee would like to have a broader understanding of what the eTech fee will accomplish.
  - d) The eTech fee has not been formally approved, but it is close to being approved and is proposed to begin in the 2012 winter quarter.
  - e) Part of the fee will go towards technology refresh and part to new eTech initiatives; the fee will also go towards filling positions in OIT that have been cut.

- 6) SFAC agenda
  - a) Budget survey and assessments will be sent out by 10/26 and will be due back to SFAC during the first week of December. The committee can review the submissions over the winter break and be ready to discuss them during the first weeks of the winter quarter.
  - b) Aaron will set up a Google Group (or something similar) and Karen will electronically archive the submissions in the Google Group for the committee to access.
  - c) The committee would like to form some subcommittees to work on the following:
    - i) In depth unit budget reviews;
    - ii) Student fee budget/budget reduction review;
    - iii) CMSF subcommittee
  - d) Subcommittees will need to define scope of reviews, parameters, what type of information they are looking for, etc.
  - e) The discussion on the 2011-12 SFAC agenda will be tabled until the 10/31/11 meeting.
  
- 7) Meeting adjourned.