

Student Fee Advisory Committee

December 2, 2010
Meeting Minutes

Present: Elaine Won, Aaron Tso, Jason Lee, Erin Kelly, Andres Gonzalez, Payel Chowdhury, Natalie Goudarzian, Clara Schultheiss, Sandra Jones

Absent: Adam Van Wart, David Curry, Nidal Zmily, Sitara Nayudu

Guest: EVCP Michael Gottfredson

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

1) Meeting called to order.

2) EVCP Gottfredson's Visit

- a) The EVCP provided the committee with an overview of the general budgetary situation for UC given the ongoing state budget crisis.
 - i) Previous eight years were all growth periods for UCI with the campus adding an average of 900 students per year, one major research building each year, 4,500 new beds, and a new hospital.
 - ii) For the last two years, the campus has been greatly impacted by the economy and the state budget situation.
 - iii) The campus has reduced the base budget by reducing both permanent budgets and recurring funding.
 - iv) In addition to budget cuts, the campus also had to absorb ~\$70M in unavoidable mandatory increases from benefit cost increases, purchased utilities, collective bargaining agreements covering multiple years, etc
 - v) ~85% of the campus budget of \$1.8B is for personnel costs for campus, mainly faculty and staff; UCI is the second largest employer in Orange County. The budget was stabilized by mostly personnel actions because personnel cost ~85% of budget. Actions included a two-year hiring freeze, salary cuts (through furloughs) ranging from ~8% to 8.5% for staff and faculty, and some layoffs. Layoffs were targeted; the goal was not to have many layoffs (less than 100).
- b) Funding sources for UCI includes student fees, state sources, sales and services (auxiliary enterprises including the hospital), donor income, contracts and grants. Most revenue sources have been affected by the economy and by the state budget crisis. The campus is looking at revenues and needs to find ways of creating new income including:
 - i) Adding more fee-based courses such as graduate professional programs, self-supporting programs, and UNEX programs.
 - ii) Taxing all auxiliaries and self-supporting programs.

- c) The campus has formed 12 highly focused task forces to examine revenue generation or expense curtailment (centralizing activities such as IT, etc.), and to look at ways to increase output and productivity.
- d) State budget was passed in October. The new governor will submit new budget in the first week of January 2011. The state's current year budget has not been resolved, and it is unknown what Governor-elect Brown will do to address current year budget. There is a good possibility of mid-year budget cuts that could likely affect UC (between \$0 and losing all funds restored to UC's budget by Governor Schwarzenegger).
- e) The state has been changing the ideal of funding/financing public education for the last several years; higher education is now considered to be a private good, not public good. State funding for UC has been decreasing incrementally for about 15 years, but has been dramatically reduced for the last 2 years. Access to higher education without quality is an empty promise; the quality of a UC degree cannot be diminished.
- f) Questions and Answers:

Q: With the new Student Services Fee guidelines in place, what is the vision for SFAC, and how will the guidelines be implemented at UCI?

A: There probably isn't a material change to what the campus SFAC is already doing. SFAC can do whatever they would like in reviewing and making recommendations to the EVCP, and there is a specific portion of new funds the committee will allocate. The EVCP also interested in opinion of worthiness of allocated funds and new funding requests; are there additional things that are meritorious? In our assessment of what we reviewed, are there additional things that might also be funded?

Q: In future, will there be additional fees for double majors?

A: It's been talked about. It may be tied to number of units, not necessarily double majors, or not necessarily in x amount of years, or to unrelated double majors. UCI doesn't generally have a problem with languishing students. The state legislature sometimes tries to affect this with statutory language. UC will continue to monitor to make sure there aren't trends in inefficiencies. Most proposals looking at efficiencies may affect quality. A four-year requirement may not be possible for some students, although it will likely be recommended by someone in the state legislature.

Q: There have been increases in fees, even for funded graduate students. What plan is there to protect grad student education (i.e., increased demands on TAs, etc.)?

A: In terms of funding the grad program, we don't support the same Ed Fee increase for graduate academics as undergraduates that have happened. The \$50M cost of funding graduate education is the single largest discretionary cost to campus; campus has increased graduate support funding by about 1/2 to TAs and about 1/2 to other graduate support. ~40% graduate RAs are on grants; grants don't go up when fees go up. It is now cheaper to hire post docs rather than grad students for RAs. The cost of 1.0 TA FTE is ~\$60K/year; an assistant professor is also ~\$60/year. TAs are so expensive relative to job market creates a dilemma for administration. Graduate academic fees should not be increased because it is punitive to the campus, but the Regents don't want to appear favoring graduate students over undergraduate by having different fee increases. The Blue and Gold program has help undergraduates, but it is difficult for graduate students.

Q: What will the future be for graduate education when fees keep increasing? Will graduate student enrollment be decreasing in future years?

A: The academic job market may be affected. How big should our PhD programs be? Professional programs will continue to increase; there is weak job market in some professions, but very strong in some markets (i.e., nursing, medicine, some business). UCI will keep quality indicators up, but market may still be affected. The campus would still like to increase graduate enrollment up to 25% from 17% of the student population.

We need to make sure current students don't suffer a decline in quality of education right now. The campus is highly focused on the educational experience to make sure it does not regress. Part of SFAC's task is to make sure the overall student experience does not decline.

2. Minutes from 11/4/10 meeting approved with amendment to remove Payel from the "present" list.
3. Winter quarter meeting times were discussed. Tuesdays or Thursdays at 1:00 pm is a possibility; Aaron is still waiting for some members to complete the Doodle, and he will send out a reminder.
4. SFAC yearly goals were discussed. Some goals included:
 - a. Allocating \$100K in incremental Student Services Fee funds
 - b. Identifying other needs beyond \$100K (i.e., the Student Health Center, the Career Center)
 - c. Seeing if previous recommendations were productive
 - d. Building stronger recommendations to EVCP; EVCP should have more committee input
 - e. Examining the size of the committee; size led to problems with time schedule
 - f. Consider setting a specific meeting time (i.e., afternoon to mid-afternoon on Fridays—2:00 pm to 4:00 pm for the spring quarter)
 - g. Improving the efficiency of meetings
 - h. Revisit goals at first meeting of winter quarter
5. Meeting adjourned.