

**UC Irvine Student Fee Advisory Committee
2015-2016 Annual Report**

I. Introduction

As per Regental Policy 3101: The University of California Student Tuition and Fee Policy, the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) on each UC Campus is assigned the role of providing recommendations on the use of Student Services Fees and each year's Student Services Fee (SSF) as set by the Regents. In accordance with this charge, the UC Irvine SFAC provides the following recommendations:

II. Allocations

During the 2015-2016 academic year, SFAC received funding allocation proposals from various campus units totaling ~\$1,600,000 in requested funds. From those requests, SFAC could make recommendations up to this year's incremental SSF funding of \$250,000. Those recommendations, all for permanent funding, are detailed below.

Table 1: 2015-2016 SFAC Funding Recommendations

Proposed Allocations	Permanent Funding
Division of Undergraduate Education Subtotal	\$2,500
DUE Student Transition Services (STS): annual funding for a Book Loan Program to allow eligible students to check out textbooks	\$2,500
Student Affairs—Student Life and Leadership (SL&L) Subtotal	\$149,024
SL&L Campus Orgs: 1.0 FTE SAO III to support and work with community service programming	\$54,212
SL&L Campus Orgs: funding for student interns (4) for approx. 10hrs/wk	\$9,600
SL&L LGBT Resource Center: 0.20 FTE Psychologist Liaison from the Counseling Center to support students in crisis and run identity programs and workshops on mental health and wellbeing.	\$16,000
SL&L Veteran Services: 1.0 FTE SAO II/Assistant Director to develop resources and training for a veteran specific summer bridge program, a "Veterans in Higher Education" course and a workshop series to assist veterans with career goals, self-care and wellness.	\$54,212
SL&L Cross Cultural Center: programming support to sustain and grow the center's signature programs (Community Roots Festival, MLK Jr Symposium, REACH, Deconstruction Series and Women's & Gender Initiatives)	\$15,000
Student Affairs—Wellness, Health and Counseling Services Subtotal	\$44,264
WH&CS Career Center: travel stipends to allow students with financial need to participate in UCDC and Sacramento internship programs and Job Shadow opportunities*	\$18,935
WH&CS Center for Student Wellness & Health Promotion: 0.25 FTE Registered Dietician/Nutritionist for clinical, education and outreach services	\$18,309
WH&CS Disability Services Center: Sensus Access license—online tool that will allow students easier access to their reading materials	\$3,000
WH&CS Counseling Center: fund salary raise for doctoral intern to \$29,730	\$4,020
Student Affairs—Enrollment Services Subtotal	\$54,212
SOAR: 1.0 FTE SAO III Dreamer Coordinator to assist students with academic, financial, legal, emotional and professional development needs, and to coordinate events that increase the community's knowledge about laws and policies impacting their student experience.	\$54,212
GRAND TOTAL	\$250,000

*Regarding the Career Center’s request for student travel stipends, the committee recommends partial funding of \$25,000 (\$18,935 to come from SSF funds and the remaining \$6,065 to be provided by the campus).

The above recommendations have been made by considering the priorities recognized in the 2015-2016 Student Survey. The details of which are as follows:

III. 2015-2016 Student Survey SFAC Analysis

Student Services: Perceived Importance by the Student Body

Students were asked how important they viewed each category was to the campus on a scale of 1-5 (5 being ‘very important’). For the purposes of this report, we will define each category’s importance rating by the percentage of respondents who rated the service a 4 or greater.

Of the categories featured, Academic Advising scored highest with an apparent importance of 77%. Other highly rated services worth noting include the Student Health Center, Career Center, Counseling Center and Anteater Express, all of which had an importance rating of over 65%. However, it is also critical to mention these ratings do not equate with student approval. As many students pointed out in the survey’s comments section, they considered some services ‘very important’ but in need of much improvement.

Below is a summary of this survey section using the definition of importance as defined above.

Table 2: Reported Importance of Various Student Services

Student Service	Importance Rating (≥4 on 5 pt scale)
Academic Advising	77%
Student Health Center	73%
Career Center	71%
Counseling Center	68%
Anteater Express	65%
Disability Services Center	63%
Campus Recreation (ARC)	61%
Campus Assault Resources and Education (CARE)	59%
Graduate Resource Center	48%
Health Education	47%
Veteran Services Center	40%
LGBT Resource Center	40%
International Center	39%
Cross Cultural Center	37%
SOAR Center	37%
Child Care Center	31%
Center for Educational Partnerships	29%
Bren Center	27%

Student Services: Frequency of Use

Students were then asked how often they used these services in the past academic year and given the options between 0 times, 1-2 times, 3-5 times and 5+ times. The table below shows the percentage of students who reported using each service 3 times or more.

As can be seen, the results differ significantly from that of perceived importance, which is not surprising. Past surveys indicate a similar trend; the students surveyed may believe in the purpose of certain services without having found reason to use them personally. The ARC and Anteater express appear to be the most frequently used services, with over 50% of students reporting their use 3 times or more a year.

Table 3: Reported Frequency of Use for Various Campus Services

Student Service	Frequency of Use (≥ 3 times/yr)
Campus Recreation (ARC)	60%
Anteater Express	52%
Academic Advising	31%
Student Health Center	23%
Bren Center	19%
Career Center	18%
Counseling center	13%
Cross Cultural Center	11%
SOAR Center	7%
International Center	6%
Graduate Resource Center	6%
Disability Services Center	4%
Health Education	3%
LGBT Resource Center	2%
Veteran Services Center	2%
Center for Educational Partnerships	2%
Campus Assault Resources and Education (CARE)	1%
Child Care Center	1%

Mental Health

Students were asked if they agreed that the stigma of mental health care affected their decisions to seek the service. Approximately 37% of student respondents expressed that it did, and 27% of student respondents marked 'neutral' (neither agreed nor disagreed). Among all respondents, 22% of students claimed they have used mental health services either on or off campus during their undergraduate career.

When asked about suggestions for improvement, most students asked for better visibility for mental health services (some were surprised to hear a counseling center existed) as well as increased accessibility through shorter waitlists and additional staff.

Registered Campus Organizations

52% of students surveyed admitted to being part of a club on campus, suggesting club assistance (room reservations, event specialists, etc.) is a critical service for many students.

Referenda

Recreation and Athletics, Student Center, TGIF, Campus Shuttles, and eTech fees all scored above 55% in terms of perceived importance. By contrast, Club Sports, Associated Students, Measure U, Bren Events Center, and Campus Spirit each scored below 40% in perceived importance. While far from conclusive, these results may be useful in predicting student reactions towards future referenda.

Other Services

Students were asked what other services they would like to see. Among the more common suggestions were subsidized and additional parking, a better quality and healthier selection of dining options on campus, better quality campus shuttles and more diverse shuttle routes.

Survey Respondent Statistics--concerns to be noted

Only 1,490 students filled out the survey, despite prize incentives and substantial publicity through several email blasts and social media campaigns. However, the committee's greater concern is the disparity among the survey respondents. For instance, only 33 students identified as African/African American and only 18 as Native American/Alaskan Native. Such a disparity should be noted when using the survey results to identify priority services specific to those campus communities.

A second concern is the percentage of students who report living on-campus, which may provide a bias in survey results given their proximity and relatively greater accessibility to student services. 54% of student respondents identified as living on-campus.

Lastly, 15% of the survey respondents identified as graduate students, suggesting there was a disproportionate amount of graduate student respondents as compared to their presence within the overall student body. This is another source of error that can potentially detract from the perceived importance and frequency of use of specific services utilized more commonly by older students.

Campus Use

Despite the points of concern above, it has not escaped our notice that this survey's results may be incredibly valuable to various campus units, particularly because of comments students have left with regards to specific centers and referenda. We thus encourage the campus leadership to assist us in distributing the data to pertinent units, in the hopes they will find it useful for development and future endeavors.

IV. SSF Allocation Recommendation Process

The SFAC identified four areas of focus in this year's funding requests, consistent with the student survey data and past SFAC deliberations. These priority themes were: Career & Non-Academic Advising/Academic Advising, Student Life, Campus Climate and Health & Wellness.

The committee was thereby divided into four subcommittees, each of which ranked pertinent funding allocation proposals with respect to their priority theme. Particular consideration was given to funding proposals with a large potential for impact and which aligned with

demonstrated student needs. The committee then reconvened in full to review each proposal on a case-by-case basis, using the proposals' numerical average rankings across all relevant priority themes to gauge their importance and relevance to the student body.

Committee Recommendations on Priority Themes

1. Career & Non-Academic Advising/Academic Advising

Requests in this priority theme category came from the following campus units:

- Bren School of ICS
- Career Center
- Graduate Division
- Merage School of Business
- School of Medicine
- School of Physical Sciences
- School of Social Ecology
- Veteran Services

Upon consideration of these requests and the limited amount of funding available, the subcommittee favored proposals that promised broader impact across various schools. As such, the subcommittee's ranking reflected priority for the Career Center's request to fund internship and job shadowing travel stipends for students with financial need.

Consideration was also given to requests regarding faculty-student retreats, leadership or financial literacy training, and additional school staff. However, the SFAC did not pursue these as the subcommittee believed these requests were outranked by proposals of higher student need in other priority themes.

Requests that asked to fund equipment or one-time services were given lowest priority; the subcommittee believed these proposals should be met by school-based funding.

2. Student Life and Leadership

Requests in this priority theme category came from the following campus units:

- Campus Recreation
- Center for Student Wellness and Health Promotion
- Claire Trevor School of the Arts
- Disability and Services Center
- Division of Undergraduate Education
- KUCI
- School of Physical Sciences
- SOAR
- Student Housing
- Student Life and Leadership: Campus Orgs
- VC Commencement
- Veteran Services
- WH&CS AVC

The subcommittee on Student Life and Leadership prioritized requests that could most powerfully impact and enrich student lives. Among the requests given highest priority were proposals designed to alleviate financial burdens on students and those assisting understaffed departments with a high student demand. These include DUE's book loan program, Veteran Service's request for 1.0 FTE to assist with operations, Student Life & Leadership's request for 1.0 FTE for community service programming and SOAR's request for 1.0 FTE for a Dreamer Coordinator.

Requests for small student programs, equipment and event costs were given lower priority, as they were either deemed less important than other requests or believed to be a weaker investment than hiring FTE SAO's who could facilitate those very programs. The subcommittee also agreed that it was more important to hire individuals who could help campus units meet current student demands than to focus on events that existed outside of those demands.

Despite the high number of priority requests for FTE SAO's, the subcommittee maintains a preference for student employees whenever possible; when the required work is the same, SSF funds are better invested in teaching and providing students with those employment opportunities than they are in hiring full time staff.

3. *Campus Climate*

Requests in this priority theme category came from the following campus units:

- CARE
- Cross Cultural Center
- Disability Services Center
- LGBT Resource Center
- School of Medicine
- SOAR
- Student Housing
- Veteran Services

Priorities for the Campus Climate subcommittee included the LGBT Resource Center, CARE, SOAR and Cross Cultural Center. This subcommittee also focused on each request's potential impact (whether to specific students or to the campus as a whole), believing the requests with greater need were not necessarily the ones most commonly used. Proposals whose potential impact was neither broad nor relatively significant were given least priority.

4. *Health and Wellness*

Requests in this priority theme category came from the following campus units:

- Campus Recreation
- CARE
- Center for Student Wellness & Health Promotion
- Counseling Center
- KUCI
- LGBT Resource Center
- School of Medicine
- SOAR
- Student Health Center
- Veteran Services
- WH&CS AVC

The subcommittee on Health and Wellness gave highest consideration to requests to fund (or continue funding) specialized personnel required to handle the demands of various campus units. These include a psychologist liaison for the LGBT Resource Center, a nutritionist to work with WH&CS and a postdoctoral intern working with the Counseling Center.

Requests for supplies or program subsidies, especially programs SSF funds were already supporting, were given less priority.

V. Moving Forward

Given the survey's failure this year to achieve a truly accurate representation of the campus and engage more than 5% of the student body, we conclude there is a need to enhance SFAC's visibility and outreach efforts for future years. As the committee continues to improve upon its outreach efforts, we invite the campus leadership to partner more closely with us as we work to better identify areas of student need and importance.

VI. Conclusion

With an ever increasing need for student services, SFAC urges the campus leadership to continue their consultation and collaboration with students on the Student Fee Advisory Committee in addition to supporting the committee's role in identifying student needs, SSF recommendations and emerging campus priorities.

We thank you for your work and support of our committee, and for giving us the opportunity to serve the student body and UCI campus in this way.

In Solidarity,

Matthew Tsai
Chair, UCI Student Fee Advisory Committee
2015-2016 SFAC members