

Student Fee Advisory Committee

January 23, 2015

Meeting Minutes

Present: Ami Glazer, Sonali Madireddi, Matthew Tsai, Sherwynn Umali, Alexander Le, Justin Chung, Myron Lozano, John Delshadi, Isaac Straley, Sanaa Khan

Absent: Sara Lone, Felicia Martinez, Reza Zomorrodian

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

1. Meeting called to order.
2. January 23, 2015 meeting agenda approved.
3. January 9, 2015 meeting minutes approved.
4. Questions and talking points for Interim Provost Michael Clark
 - a. Need a better understanding of earmarks for SSF if state does not meet its funding obligations to UC. The campus has expressed hopes that Tuition would not have to be raised, and would be tied to state actions, but state funding does not go towards SMH. Will that mean that the campus will provide funding from other sources to support SMH?
 - b. Tier 1/critical campus needs are mostly for additional MH staff.
 - c. Graduate Division also provides SMH services that serve graduate students; 100% SMH fund allocation to Student Affairs wouldn't proportionately serve graduate students. Graduate students are currently served by social workers when they use Graduate Division services instead of going to Counseling Services or SHC.
 - d. Intercollegiate Athletics – more than 30% *[note: this amount may not be correct; in 2013-14, IA received ~23% of total SSF allocations]* of SSF allocations go towards Intercollegiate Athletics. Participation in IA programs is not available to graduate students, but graduate students still pay 1/6th of SSF revenues. Graduate student services are not funded proportionately with the graduate student population.
 - e. Funding capital projects with SSF funds to house programs that provide student services.
 - f. Funding requests to SFAC for more than \$1.8M shows an increasing need for staff positions for campus partners; there is a definite need for staffing increases that is not being met by other funding sources.
 - g. Need for awareness of capacity of incremental SFAC funds to support requests included above.
5. Meeting with IP Michael Clark
 - a. Introductions

- i. IP Clark is learning more about SFAC and appreciates the opportunity to meet with the committee.
 - ii. Approach to funding: IP Clark believes it is wise not to make really large/longer-term changes until the new provost is installed in order to not create a lot of uncertainty. But he believes the campus and SFAC can collectively manage change for both incremental funding and past funding.
 - iii. IP Clark has heard about student interest on use of fees and would like to hear more detail about this.
- b. Update on budget climate
 - i. There is a feeling uncertainty even after Regents' meeting. The governor's budget reiterated state funding is contingent on no fee increases and no increases to nonresident enrollments.
 - ii. Committee of two (governor and president) will review cost structure of UC; UCOP and DOF staff preparing for meeting on Monday (1/26?).
 - iii. It will be a very challenging year if UCI only receives our share of the 4% increase to UC's state funds; will make it difficult to even meet cost increases. 4% plus fee increases will allow UCI to manage cost increases and instructional priorities.
 - iv. Governor's stipulation to show no net increase to nonresident enrollments will be difficult; Irvine would essentially have to dis-enroll undergraduate nonresident students.
 - v. Campus would have to absorb deficit and would not be able to allocate new resources for growth and priorities.
- c. Q&A/Discussion
 - i. What if the state doesn't allocate enough resources to UC to cover needs, what would happen to fund SMH priorities? The campus would continue to focus on SMH. It would help if committee recommends on how some student services might not be as big a priority as SMH and other emerging priorities and recommend ways shift funds from existing programs to SMH.
 - ii. It does seem that funding for SSF is set so that if there no increase, there will be more state funding. If the state does not meet its funding obligation, does that mean SMH priorities would not be funded? That will probably not be the outcome. SMH is still important to the campus and the campus can shift funds to add capacity to SMH. State funds will not fully fund needs even if Tuition/SSF increase is bought out.
 - iii. IA gets a large proportion of 20000 funds at UCI. UCSD allocates a significant portion of SSF funds to their SHC including buying out first few visits, lower insurance rates than other campus. There are differences in how the two campuses participated in NCAA athletics, so funding structure has been different. UCSD was Division III and then went to Division II then went to Division I more recently. UCI made decision to go to Division I right away and used SSF funds to support this.
 - iv. SSF funds should not fund more than half of IA's budget. UCI has not gone over 50%, but it is close and it is much more than other UCs. IA does not serve all students equally, but the benefits IA reaps are disproportionate to the amount of funding it gets. The strength of UCI is its academic mission and

excellent academics rather than sports events. Spending this much money on IA instead of co-curricular activities including SMH is not supported by SFAC. Previous recommendations to the Provost-EVC/EVCP raised this issue.

- v. Graduate and professional students pay 1/6th of the fees, but they cannot participate in IA programs, and their fee revenue should be allocated to other services that support the needs of graduate students, particular graduate division. Graduate counselors are needed; SSF funds are currently allocated to Student Affairs (Counseling Center and SHC), but are not proportionately allocated to Graduate Division for similar services it provides. IP Clark would be interested to know what general student body feels about Athletics' funding; would like the committee to try to get information about students' attitude on this. IP Clark has heard the other side as well and that UCI Athletics is important to other students as a source of identity.
 - vi. It's not that students have antipathy towards IA, but there are other areas that are so underfunded and yet more important to them such as career services, SMH services, academic counseling. Most students are not aware of how much is spent on athletics; committee suspects that if pie chart were shown to students they may not see that favorably (it's noted that the pie chart was included in this year's Student Fee Survey on Survey Monkey). IP Clark would like to see a summary of the survey results.
 - vii. IP Clark notes that some areas have been long funded and may now be a waning priority for students. Once these areas are identified, the funds can possibly be moved over time (a phased-in movement of funds). Using the Student Affairs pie chart for example, when people talk about priorities in a funding category is this pie sliced the way you think it should be? Survey results might show some student feedback on this.
 - viii. The campus need both direct student input and input from student leadership too and the SFAC; don't give up on representative government.
 - ix. Can SSF increases be unlinked from Tuition increases? Possible, but not likely.
- d. Closing/Wrap Up
- i. IP Clark spoke about the campus's budget model and how allocations have been made to campus while it was growing. The campus has moved away from a growth model, so the question is what will the change be for the new model? At UCI with growth, there was more funding for growth for faculty, buildings, etc. UCI is moving away from that model and it is a huge change for the campus. Also, the state's contribution to UC education will likely diminish over the years, so what are we going to do? We need to find other ways of fund UC education such as other revenue sources – exploring nonresident enrollments increasing online courses to take pressure off of FWS quarters; maintaining or increasing fees for specific services, etc. We also need to reexamine priorities for funding; there needs to be a small but persistent effort to rethink what has been done in the past. Now is the time to come up with ideas of how to do things differently. IP Clark realizes the

committee takes its charge seriously and the time it spends on student fee issues is certainly worth it and is appreciated.

- ii. The committee does try to identify student needs and appreciates to opportunity to contribute and also appreciates the IP's time.
- iii. IP Clark will let the committee know if there is anything that may affect the university's deliberations with the governor. The governor's current scenario will result in an effective cut to UC. The campus's basic planning principle is that next year will look pretty much like this year, maybe a little worse.

6. Meeting adjourned.