Student Fee Advisory Committee

April 25, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Present: Sonali Madireddi, Sarada Cleary, Bob Gomez, Isaac Straley, Naaz Mirreghabie, Anastasia Kosenko, John Delshadi, Dominique Doan, Myron Lozano, Nicole Hisatomi

Absent: Melissa Gamble, Justin Chung, Jason Lee

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

- 1. Meeting called to order.
- 2. April 25, 2014 meeting agenda approved.
- 3. April 18, 2014 meeting minutes approved.
- 4. Budget Surveys
 - a. Physical Sciences
 - i. Request: funding for commemorative items and to rent space in the Student Center for commencement (\$1,000).
 - ii. In the past, Physical Science has made a similar request, but hasn't received additional funds from SFAC.
 - iii. The average rank by the committee is 4 (1-5, with 1 being the highest).
 - b. CARE Follow Up
 - i. Request: permanent funding for new Assistant Director Position (\$71,000, with salary and benefits; \$56,000 in salary).
 - ii. CARE provided additional clarification on the role of the Assistant Director, if the duties overlap with the Director's responsibilities, and who will assume the duties is the position is not funded. CARE also provided detail on what duties serves students directly.
 - 1. The Assistant Director will aid/collaborate with the Director and support future program activities. The Assistant Director will assume role of the Director in the Director's absence and will collaborate with the Director on developing and implementing CARE's overall goals and objectives and that CARE is in compliance with Federal mandates. Additional detail is provided in the written response.
 - 2. The duties will fall to the Director and other staff if the position is not filled, and/or some of the programmatic support to students that would have been provided will not be offered at all.
 - iii. Seems like a lot of need; increased student need.
 - iv. Are they struggling to meet the additional needs? There seems to be increased/growing student need. There are needs for new events, new training events, and a need for additional funding to support the students and staff

- (based on feedback Sonali had from a discussion with CARE staff). New programs are priority.
- v. Approximately 20,411 students have been served by CARE (including undergraduates, graduate students, disabled students, underrepresented minority students and veterans).
- vi. The average rank by committee is 2.

c. Counseling Center Follow Up

- i. Request #1: permanent funds of \$10,000 to bring PhD intern salaries up to the UC average salary.
- ii. Request #2: permanent funds of \$41,000 for an additional 0.50 FTE for a new Psychologist position.

iii. Follow up:

- 1. Per the AVC's office there are not additional SMH-earmarked funds from the SSF available for staffing; Student Affairs administration is unable to cost share a portion of the funding.
- 2. The Counseling Center could still utilize SFAC funds if the committee could only fund a portion of their request. If necessary, the Counseling Center would add part-time and/or contract staff.
- iv. The request for the new psychologist should be looked at in tandem with LGBT's request. Feedback from Student Affairs seemed to indicate if this position is funded, some of the psychologist's time can be dedicated to the LGBT Resource Center (or some of existing staff's time can be redeployed to the LGBT Resource Center.
- v. Request for graduate intern salaries was made last year; the committee requests they look at other sources.
- vi. If mental health service funding is provided outside of the Counseling Center, it could open up doors where specific departments would start requesting funding for their own counselors (rather than the counseling services being coordinated by the Counseling Center). There should be a dialog between departments and the Counseling Center to request counseling support.
- vii. It should be communicated to the Counseling Center that the committee recommends supporting the Counseling Center request, but funded position, or other staff time, should be allocated for LGBT counseling; LGBT RC should also be told their request was not recommended for funding, but the committee will recommend the Counseling Center provide counseling support specifically in the LGBT Resource Center.
- viii. The average rank for the staff psychologist position is 1 and 4 for the doctoral intern salary increases.

d. LGBT Resource Center Follow Up

- i. Request: \$16,000 for a new therapist/liaison between LGBT RC and the Counseling Center.
- ii. The LGBT RC clarified that the therapist would be supervised by Counseling Center staff and would work part-time in each area.
- iii. The committee has decided to focus on the Counseling Center's request and provide a recommendation that would serve both the Counseling Center and the LGBT RC (see Counseling Center request above).

- e. New Narratives Follow Up
 - i. Request: \$43,000 in permanent funds to continue program.
 - ii. The average rank by the committee is 5.
- f. Engineering Student Affairs
 - i. Request: \$106,586 (salaries and benefits; \$77,800 for salaries) in permanent funds for additional 2.0 SAO FTEs: one Graduate SAO and one Undergraduate SAO.
 - ii. Engineering PAAs have not been helpful; consistently have been give incorrect information. Students sometimes have had to go to SAOs after seeing PAAs and the SAOs are generally putting out fires because PAA do not provide correct information.
 - iii. Engineering could probably use an additional SAO, but other schools could also use more as well.
 - iv. The committee could possibly recommend funding a partial amount or only one position.
 - v. The quality of PAAs need to be questioned
 - vi. The average rank by the committee is 4.

5. CSF Standardization Report

- a. Each campus needs to come up with questions that should be asked and introduced into the CSF year-end reports.
- b. Different questions could pertain to some of requests SFAC is getting and how the requests are dealt with, why or why not requests were funded (i.e., New Narratives), etc.
- c. Questions could ask about some problems each SFACs are facing.
- d. UCI could include questions about all referendum (for instance, SOAR and Club Sports referenda), sunset clauses and how they were included in each referendum.
- e. There could also be questions about the lack of accountability with SSFs and campusbased fees; there needs to be assurance that SSF funds are being used as recommended by SFAC and campus-based fees be used as specified in referenda language.

6. Meeting adjourned.