

**UC Irvine Student Fee Advisory Committee
2014-2015 Annual Report**

1. Introduction

As per Regental Policy 3101: The University of California Student Tuition and Fee Policy, the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) on each individual UC Campus is charged with providing recommendations on the use of Student Services Fees and the annual Student Services Fee (SSF) to be set by the Regents. With regard to this Policy, the UC Irvine SFAC provides the following recommendations:

2. Allocations

During the 2014-2015 academic year, SFAC was charged with making recommendations on permanent allocations of \$250,000 in incremental SSF funding in addition to \$41,500 in remaining permanent funds from the 2013-2014 year. Based on deliberations by the committee, the following recommendations represent allocations of permanent funds totalling \$291,500.

1. *Unit:* Student Affairs Wellness Health & Counseling Services Health Education, *Amount:* \$5,000

Purpose: Funds to support providing condoms and other barrier protection options for HE Center, and HE Center partners--SHC, CARE, Counseling Center and LGBTRC.

2. *Unit:* Student Affairs Student Life & Leadership LGBT Resource Center, *Amount:* \$43,672 (salary only; benefits funded centrally)

Purpose: Permanently fund a contract position (SAO II Program Coordinator) whose funds will expire in June 2015. The position will augment two current staff positions needed to support increased student services (education, training, meetings with students, developing student leadership, create community and support other campus departments requesting LBGTRC expertise), and document recommendations of LGBT task force and mental health reports focusing on the most at risk student populations, including LGBTQIA students.

3. *Unit:* Student Affairs Wellness Health & Counseling Services Career Center, *Amount:* \$2,500

Purpose: To purchase annual campus license for Read and Write Gold writing software for individuals with print disabilities and second language learners. The

campus license is unlimited and will be available to every UCI student and allows students to hear and manipulate their textbooks and other academic articles and materials.

4. *Unit:* Student Affairs Wellness Health & Counseling Services Campus Assault Resources & Education, *Amount:* \$5,000

Purpose: Permanent funds for annual supplies and expense budget to support current level of programming.

5. *Unit:* Student Affairs Student Life and Leadership Greek Life, *Amount:* \$52,633

Purpose: 1.0 FTE SAO III to support UCOP recommendations to fight sexual assault on campus, increase sexual assault education in the fraternity/sorority community, improve campus climate, increase diversity education, increase leadership development opportunities, increase Greek Life staff levels to be closer to peer UC campuses.

6. *Unit:* Student Affairs Student Life and Leadership Cross Cultural Center, *Amount:* \$6,500

Purpose: Annual funding for Summer Multicultural Leadership Institute.

7. *Unit:* Student Affairs Student Government Associated Graduate Students, *Amount:* \$25,000

Purpose: Professional development programming to increase offerings particularly to women, at risk graduate and professional students among other underrepresented graduate communities. Funds include support for the AGS Symposium.

8. *Unit:* Academic Affairs Graduate Division, *Amount:* \$48,191 (salary only; benefits funded centrally)

Purpose: 1.0 FTE Graduate Counselor II for more vulnerable members of the graduate student population by integrating academic and counseling resources on campus. The counselor will serve as a point of reference for faculty and staff in need of assistance in dealing with difficult student cases.

9. *Unit:* Student Affairs Student Life & Leadership Campus Organizations, *Amount:* \$43,672 (salary only; benefits funded centrally)

Purpose: 1.0 FTE for a Program Coordinator (SAO II) for Campus Organizations and Commuter Student Resources to assist with programming, marketing,

assessment, advisement of RCOs, and initiation of programs for commuter students.

10. *Unit:* Student Affairs Wellness Health & Counseling Services Campus Recreation, *Amount:* \$5,000

Purpose: Funds to reduce CPR training fee for students involved in clubs and organizations from \$70/person to \$20/person.

11. *Unit:* Student Affairs Wellness Health & Counseling Services Career Center, *Amount:* \$52,633 (salary only; benefits funded centrally)

Purpose: 1.0 FTE for Career Counselors-SAO III, for students who are neither Business nor STEM majors. Additional counseling and resources are needed for these students to prepare them for success in their future job searches.

12. *Unit:* Student Affairs Wellness Health & Counseling Services Campus Recreation, *Amount:* \$1,699

Purpose: Permanent funds to fund Fitness Voucher Program (one-time funds provided by AVC for successful pilot program in fall 2014). The program is a collaborative effort with Campus Recreation, SHC, Counseling Center, and CARE targeted at students who have been told by health care/counseling professionals that they can benefit from a physical fitness program. The total amount requested was \$5,000; however, the committee did not have the funds to fully fund the request and the committee recommends the campus fund the remaining amount of \$3,301 from other campus resources.

The above recommendations have been made by considering the priorities recognized in the 2014-2015 Student Survey. The details of which are as follows:

3. 2014-2015 Student Survey SFAC Analysis

Perceived Importance by the Student Body

Of the centers featured, Academic Advising, Student Health, Counseling and Anteater Express both expressed large majority of student support (60-70% votes a rating above 3/5). The ARC, Career Center, CARE, Disability Services, and Graduate Resource Center make up the next tier, at about 50-60% above 3/5 rating. The Bren Center, Career for Educational Partnerships, Child Care, CCC, LGBT Center, International Center, SOAR and Veteran Services came in last, an average of only 30% approval.

Personal Use

These results differ significantly from that of perceived importance. It seems the students surveyed believe in the purpose of several institutions on campus, but have never found reason to seek their services for themselves. The ARC and Anteater express rank among the most frequently used services, followed closely by Academic Advising (all three show 70-80% student use by the students surveyed). Only 50% of students surveyed use the Career Center, the Student Health Center and the Bren Center. All other services see less than 25% student use.

Mental Health

Students were asked on their opinion if the stigma of mental health care affected their decisions to seek the service. The resulting consensus was neutral. While relatively large percentages of respondents claimed they would seek mental health care for stress-related issues, emotional problems or academic topics, only 18% admitted to ever having used mental health services (both on or off campus). When asked, students provided solutions to this problem. The most prominent suggestions related to better visibility and customer service.

Registered Campus Organizations

Only 50% of students surveyed admitted to being part of a club on campus. Of the 50%, 28% book rooms in the Student Center.

Referenda

Bren Events Center Fee, AS, Recreation, TGIF, Campus Shuttles, and eTech fees, all averaged around 3-4 out of 5 for student approval/perceived importance. The New U, Club Sports initiative and Campus Spirit Fees were noticeably lower, around 2-3 out of 5.

Other Services

Students were asked what other services they would like to see. Among the more common suggestions were increased academic resources, subsidized parking and tuition, added swim and football teams, better internet service, and increased transportation (including buses on weekends).

Survey Respondent Statistics--concerns to be noted

The survey compiles results from over 5,000 students, over a 2 year period. For accurate assessment of this year's needs, I suggest comparing the current results to last year's.

Since the survey is rolling, it does allow for students to take it multiple times. Preliminary analysis shows about 14.2% of responses can be disregarded due to duplications (assuming people didn't drastically change their mind within one year).

Just over 50% of respondents live on campus, defined to include the ACC apartments and any other housing options UCI endorses. The committee's opinion is that we can assume on-campus residents have a greater knowledge of campus centers than their commuter counterparts.

Less than 1% of respondents identified as being transgender, which may account for the lower recorded value of the LGBT center. The survey does not ask for sexual preference, however, only with which sex a student identifies. Regarding that, there were 20% more female respondents than males, which may provide a skewed perspective of services in demand.

Education details vary significantly, with most students coming from the schools of Social Sciences (16%), Social Ecology (12%), Engineering (13%), and Biological Sciences (13%), all of which are fairly large portions of the undergraduate body. Surprisingly, 21% of respondents identified as graduate students, with the undergraduate portion showing a majority of first years (30%) and third years (26%). This puts the Graduate Resource Center's results under speculation, and suggests the data may be skewed by a population sample that is not fully aware of UC Irvine's resources. For example first years may have never visited certain centers, not because they feel they offer no value, but because they are unaware of their existence.

83% of the respondents identify as California residents, 7% out of state and 10% being international.

To conclude, with regards to the efficacy of this survey, the abovementioned concerns make clear a need for revisions in the survey process. It is recommended students be exposed to SFAC's existence and purpose prior to the release of the survey, to garner student interest and a larger number of responses. Furthermore, to ensure a more accurate representation of student interests on campus, it is suggested the survey team of future SFAC years prioritize collaboration with other campus units (Housing,

Hospitality and Dining, ASUCI, etc.) to maximize publicity in a variety of student communities.

4. Allocation Recommendation Process and Priority Allocation Areas

Based on the analysis of the survey data results compiled and demonstrated as above, the committee formulated five priority areas based on which the SSF allocation recommendations have been made. The process explanation is as follows:

Process Explanation including Priority Themes

The SFAC identified four key trends in the 2014-2015 funding requests, which aligned with results from the student survey and the Campus Climate Survey 2014. The committee identified Career & Non-Academic Advising/Academic Advising, Student Life, Campus Climate and Health & Wellness as the four areas of focus..

Committee Recommendations on Priority Themes

1. Career & Non-Academic Advising/Academic Advising

Requests in this category came from the Merage School of Business MBA Career Center, Henry Samueli School of Engineering, School of Physical Sciences, School of Social Ecology, the Department of Undergraduate Education (Writing Center and Student Transition Services), the School of Medicine, the Graduate Division. Based on the subcommittee's deliberations, it was evident that there were multiple requests from other areas of higher priority and that funds from other sources, such as school-based funding, should be provided to fund non-academic advising activities/programs in the academic units.

In addition, some of the requests received were academic-related and according to section 3.B of Regents Policy of 3101, the SSF funds may be applied towards those programs that directly benefit, but are not part of the core instructional program at that school. As some of the requests received are part of the academic mission of the school, the subcommittee decided not to move forward with funding requests received for academic-related advising.

The sub committee also recommended that additional funding be allocated to funding career staff positions in the Career Center for non-STEM and non-

Business majors because past funding recommendations have been to fund career resources for STEM/Business majors.

2. *Student Life and Leadership*

The subcommittee on Student Life and Leadership prioritized requests that directly benefit students and especially those activities that are of high importance to students. The areas of importance identified by the subcommittee were: 1) providing employment opportunities for students; and 2) prioritizing requests that would provide the most impact to students, but may not benefit the largest number of students.

Student Life and Leadership subcommittee has identified gaps in the following areas:

- a. LGBTRC - More support is needed for both LGBT students and the education of the general student population about LGBT issues.
- b. Greek Life - Need for more diversity, sexual assault education, training and other programs to improve campus climate.
- c. Campus Organizations - The number of campus organizations have grown substantially in the past years. Campus organizations do need additional resources due to the increased growth. Additionally, campus organizations need more resources to manage liability risks.
- d. Veteran Services Center - Veteran Services is in need of more funding to support their programs. Veteran services has expanded to include dependents and families, where families are in need of services provided. More resources are required to ensure that veterans are receiving the services and benefits that they have access to.
- e. There were additional requests that were important, but the subcommittee felt there were more appropriate sources of funding for them. These requests included:
 - i. Child Care Services - Potential sources of funding for additional security systems and building entrances could be from the safety grant program and the small cap program.
 - ii. New Narratives - SFAC recommended that funding for the request should be obtained from Student Affairs and from other campus resources because of higher amount of funds requested and because of limited SSF funds the committee has to make allocation recommendations.

3. *Campus Climate*

Priorities for the Campus Climate subcommittee included the Cross Cultural Center which organizes the Summer Leadership Institute program; this program has been instrumental in developing many student leaders.

4. *Health and Wellness*

The subcommittee on Health and Wellness received requests for financial support for SAO/Staff. The subcommittee deliberated on whether to fund the requests for full-time staff positions or for part-time positions. After deliberation, the subcommittee decided to recommend funding for part-time positions in order to evaluate the new hires on a part-time basis, and recommended that additional funding sources be sought to convert the part-time hires to full-time. [Note: ultimately, the committee as a whole recommended funding be provided for full-time staff positions.]

The subcommittee also recommended prioritizing student staff over full-time career staff hires in order to provide more employment and professional development opportunities for students. However, it is also duly noted that this is not appropriate for positions that require professional expertise and training in specific fields, nor for positions dealing with sensitive student information.

5. Intercollegiate Athletics (IA) Recommendations

The SFAC conducted a review of Intercollegiate Athletics which is partially funded by Student Services Fees. The major issues discussed, information/responses from IA and recommendations by the SFAC are included below.

Background:

Currently, Intercollegiate Athletics at UC Irvine receives approximately twenty-three percent (23%) of total SSF allocations. This allocation is larger than the average Athletics-related allocation across the UC System. In conversation with Interim Provost Michael Clark and Associate Vice Chancellor of Planning & Budget Rich Lynch, the committee discussed the origin of this allocation as being associated with startup costs for entering National Collegiate Athletics Association Division I. As a large and significant user of the SSF fees, the 2014-2015 SFAC conducted an inquiry into efforts to stabilize and utilize non-student fee revenues for funding the continual growth and

needs of Intercollegiate Athletics. The committee utilized the annual SSF assessment form (1-A), in addition to conducting a follow-up meeting regarding the state of the Intercollegiate Athletics' budget.

What are efforts for cultivating donors?

Currently, Intercollegiate Athletics works in conjunction with University Advancement on fundraising/donor cultivation, but development officers have been decentralized to allow more specialized donor cultivation. There are about four development staff working on IA advancement projects. Athletics giving consists of three different categories: Annual Giving (giving in any amount), Major gifts (gifts of \$25,000) and Special Events Fundraising. Athletics staff indicated that these combined efforts brought close to \$1,000,000 in donations to the department. The staff noted that donations have been increasing as UCI teams get better known and since participation in NCAA

What has been done to increase corporate sponsorship?

Corporate sponsorship development has been outsourced to a third party over the last few years due to past ineffective management of licensing fees. In the past, the campus was not receiving royalties from NCAA tournament-related merchandising.

What are the main pressures on Intercollegiate Athletics Budget?

IA has been hit on two fronts in the past several years with the rise in tuition and student fees and budget cuts. This has resulted in less money available for scholarships, and creating fewer overall scholarships. In response to these budgetary pressures, UC Irvine Athletics has cut five sports to eliminate higher cost, larger roster sports (e.g. swimming & diving) that had the most impact on the total budget. UCI has 18 NCAA teams; the minimum to remain in Division I is 14. If many more sports are cut, UCI would have to drop to Division II. Remaining teams are either staffed at bare bones levels or are the most well-known UC Irvine teams such as volleyball and basketball.

UC Irvine's IA budget is \$15M. In comparison, UCLA, a similar sized university, has a \$85 Million athletics budget; UC Berkeley has a \$76M athletics budget; UC Davis has a \$24M athletics budget; UC Santa Barbara has about a \$14.9 Million for athletics; UC Riverside has an \$11M athletics budget. UC Merced, UC San Diego and UC Santa Cruz are not Division I schools.

UC Irvine has to compete with schools like UCLA and UC Berkeley for coaches, staff and athletes with a much smaller budget.

Additionally, NCAA rule changes present an increasing threat to the stability of UCI IA. There has been a movement to pay for complete cost of attendance for athletes, not just tuition and fees. Athletics staff referred to a 'tipping point' when current operating budget will not meet the needs. In the past, budget shortfalls have been backfilled with STIP earnings funds from the Budget Office (Chancellor's Discretionary Funds).

The only other source of revenue is the Spirit Fee. The \$32 fee was passed in 1998-99 and has not kept up with inflation. According to Athletics officers, an ideal fee would keep pace not only with inflation but would also be pegged to tuition. The unique nature of the IA budget results in less available funds when tuition increases and causes the cost of scholarships to grow.

Although Athletics brings in outside revenue and has increased efforts to obtain additional outside revenue, the department is recharged for events by other campus departments, which increases the IA expenditure budget. For instance, staff eluded to an estimated \$2 million in recharges from Parking Services each year.

IA has limited staff and mainly targets in-state recruits because IA can't afford to pay for out-of-state scholarships. Currently 1.6% of the student populations are student athletes. Based on \$15M budget, IA gets about \$35,000 in Student Services Fee per athlete.

Long term outlook and assessment

Currently Athletics meets monthly with the Budget Office [Note: the last few meeting have been cancelled or postponed by IA] and have been transparent about their budget in past meetings. As alumni base grows and athletics programs attain more recognition, the goal is to secure larger sponsorships and utilize a larger donor base. Possible changes to the current funding model have been discussed both within SFAC and other spaces; ideally, new funding streams would move away from funding using Student Fee Funds.

Athletics staff identified waiving tuition for athletes, would save about \$2.5M per year and remove some budgetary pressure. NCAA changes to require scholarships to cover full cost of attendance would greatly increase IA's annual budget. Through dropping to Division II is a possible solution, it does not fit with the goal of achieving flagship status within the UC.

Recommendations

The SFAC recommends continued monitoring of the Athletics budget, and strongly urges all partners to create a long-term plan that addresses the stability of the department and eventually transitions IA from being funded by SSF funds.

6. Conclusion

With both campuswide and systemwide student services needs increasing, we urge campus leadership to continue obtaining substantive consultation and collaboration with students on the Student Fee Advisory Committee for student needs recognition, student services fee allocation recommendations and continuous tracking of changing students and campus units priorities. We thank you for this opportunity to serve the student body and the campus through the work of the Student Fee Advisory Committee.

In Solidarity,

Sonali Madireddi

Chair, UCI Student Fee Advisory Committee

2014-2015 SFAC members