

Student Fee Advisory Committee

June 3, 2011
Meeting Notes

Present: Erin Kelly, Elaine Won, Jason Lee, Payel Chowdhury, Aaron Tso, Sitara Nayudu

Absent: David Curry, Nidal Zmily, Andres Gonzalez, Justin Chung, Clara Schultheiss, Sandy Jones

Guests: Vice Chancellor Meredith Michaels, Chief Information Officer and Assistant Vice Chancellor Dana Roode, Chris Dunckle, Lowell Trott

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

- 1) Meeting called to order.
- 2) Guest and committee introductions.
- 3) May 20, 2011 minutes approved.
- 4) Campus IT Fee Proposal
 - a) Asst. Vice Chancellor Dana Roode provided an overview of the proposed UCI IT Fee in context of OIT's role and the current budget crisis.
 - i) The Los Angeles and Santa Barbara campuses have already implemented IT Fees and other campuses (i.e., Riverside) are considering implementing a fee. UCLA established its IT Fee in 1997 and currently charges \$6 per unit for L&S undergraduates and \$7 per unit for SEAS undergraduates. UCLA may be proposing a future increase. UCSB is charging \$2.50 per unit and uses the fee to fund the same things UCI is proposing.
 - ii) A draft proposal has been developed in consultation with faculty and students.
 - iii) Instructional Technology (IT) includes EEE, instructional labs, and technology in classrooms; the IT infrastructure on campus has been built incrementally over the years and IT needs have evolved over years.
 - iv) Budget constraints have limited IT on campus, but OIT has planned investments and has kept IT programs going on campus.
 - v) The current proposal is to assess across broad class categories at \$4 or \$3 per unit, capped at 15 units; this is about \$60 per quarter.
 - vi) The fee may be limited to "student learning" and the proposal may include charging a lower fee for classes that use less of core IT activities (i.e., some grad classes, research units). There are about 1.2M total UCI SCHs, with about 200,000 SCHs that

- could possibly be exempted for one reason or another. The proposed fees may generate approximately \$3M to \$4M in total revenue.
- vii) Students will continue to have a voice. There is a proposed fee board with proposed structure in which students will be represented, and there will be systematic and ongoing surveys to guide initiatives.
 - viii) The current proposal includes: 1) equipment refresh (equipment replacement); 2) staff support for IT including existing positions (for expected 2011-12 cut) and additional positions for new initiatives; and 3) new initiatives and services. The proposal does not spell out how much for each component.
 - ix) The goal is to preserve and protect the IT of interest of students. If there is no IT Fee, there will be a noticeable degradation of IT and there will be no new initiatives.

5) IT Fee Discussion/Q&A

Q: When would students be charged for the fee?

A: Looking at beginning no sooner than the winter quarter; students will be assessed after the 3rd week of classes.

Q: How is the fee level of \$3 or \$4 going to be determined?

A: The size of the IT budget cut and the overall vision for what needs to be accomplished.

Q: Grad students don't use IT for many classes. How will the fee be prorated for grad students and other courses using less IT?

A: Approximately by \$1 (still under discussion).

Q: Will the IT Fee be included in financial package for graduate students (i.e., as part of stipends)?

A: It would be up to individual deans. It could eat away at inflationary funds for grad aid packages and perhaps summer salary for grad students. Deans could look at other sources of funding.

Q (to SFAC): The fiscal message of expanding services given budget situation and the increasing fee levels students are being assessed. Is it palatable for students to pay given the austerity situation? The list is not definitive; the skeleton proposal needs to be fleshed out; how far to go beyond strictly instructional support?

A: (from SFAC): If there are fees, they should be to maintain the quality of what we already have; new initiatives could be proposed a couple of years down the line.

Q: Equipment refresh: not much equipment refresh is included now; is the \$1.5M typical for current refresh?

A: No. There is no equipment refresh budget right now; OIT is coasting with what we have so far. If budget problem was not a multi-year issue, it might not be a problem, but we have old equipment that needs to be replaced, but there isn't a budget for it.

Q: The IT Fee will be used to fill a gap with the budget, but will there be a sunset clause if the funding gap is narrowed when the budget gets better?

A: The IT Fee committee will address these types of issues if funding is found.

Comment: The impression based on comments by other student groups has been that students are more interested in new initiatives; these are the things the committee will need to address. Many new initiatives are things that should have been done in the past, but funding hasn't been available. EEE needs to be maintained at a level that we cannot currently manage.

Committee comments:

- The committee is in favor of fee being implemented, with restraint. Equipment refresh and staffing are priorities, with maybe one new initiative a year.
- This seems to be more of an undergrad issue than for grads because of classroom it needs.
- Students would be interested in more lectures on line and being able to use smart technology.
- Having an advisory board with students adds student perspective and making students part of the recommendations regarding fee levels is important. Students appointed should be similar to students appointed to SFAC; one of the students could be from SFAC. Students should have some budgetary understanding. There should be a breadth of majors.
- The general population of students may be more supportive of a fee of \$3.00-\$3.50 based on recently proposed student (campus-based fee) initiatives.

Summary:

- SFAC is generally supportive.
- We will need to flesh out details over summer .
- A board will need to be appointed during summer; the board will need to weigh in on some details.
- Proposing to go forward winter quarter.
- Exempting grad students since their usage is much less; research units for grad students and grad classes could be exempted or to have a lower fee level. Can departments cover fees for grads?
- Prioritize the IT Fee for the following: 1) equipment refresh; 2) staffing; 3) new initiative (restricting to no more than 1 new initiative per year, or one big ticket item).
- A \$3.00- \$3.50 per unit IT Fee is more palatable.

6) Annual report

- a) Motion passed to approve the annual report.

7) EVCP's response to student services priorities distributed to the committee.

- a) For future student fee budget discussions, committee will need to set an agenda, be vocal about what is important, and balance priorities with understanding that student services will need to be sacrificed to some extent.

- 8) 2011 fall quarter meeting (first meeting)
 - a) Aaron will send out doodle to returning members for fall meeting times.
- 9) Meeting adjourned.

Attached is a follow-up document sent to the committee via the email below from Vice Chancellor Michaels regarding the IT Fee discussion.

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Memo from VC Michaels to SFAC 6-8-11

Date:Thu, 09 Jun 2011 16:10:43 -0700

From:Ali Warner <awarner@uci.edu>

To:vpfinance@ags.uci.edu, payel.chowdhury@uci.edu, curryd@uci.edu,
executivevp@asuci.uci.edu, ngoudarz@uci.edu, sandy@uci.edu, ekelly@uci.edu,
jasonjl@uci.edu, president@asuci.uci.edu, clara@uci.edu, atso@uci.edu,
wone@uci.edu, nzmily@uci.edu

CC:Karen MIZUMOTO <karen.mizumoto@uci.edu>, "Dana F. ROODE"
<dana.roode@uci.edu>, president@ags.uci.edu, president@asuci.uci.edu, Sitara Aithra
Nayudu <snayudu@uci.edu>, Steven Robert Scifo <sscifo@uci.edu>, "Michael R.
Gottfredson" <gottfred@uci.edu>

On behalf of Meredith Michaels, I'm sending you the attached memo. No hard copy will be provided. Thank you.

--

Ali Warner

Planning and Budget
University of California, Irvine
454 Aldrich Hall
Irvine, CA 92697-3025
(949) 824-0576 Phone
(949) 824-2276 Fax
awarner@uci.edu

June 8, 2011

MEMBERS, STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thank you for taking time last Friday to meet with Dana and me regarding a proposed Instructional Technology Course Materials and Services Fee. To make sure we understand your input, I am writing to confirm the following:

- 1) The committee supports moving forward with the implementation of an Instructional Technology Course Materials and Services Fee.
- 2) You would like the level not to exceed the \$3 to \$3.50 range.
- 3) We will flesh out the details over the summer.
- 4) You suggest that priority be given to maintaining existing instructional services and equipment and that restraint be exercised when considering new initiatives.
- 5) You support establishing an IT fee advisory committee, which will review and advise on the detailed implementation plan. We will consult with ASUCI, AGS, the Academic Senate, and VC Parham on the composition of this group.
- 6) You expect implementation could be as soon as Winter 2011, but no later than Spring 2012.

Again, thank you for working with us on this proposal. If anything above is mis-stated, please let us know. We will continue to work with ASUCI and AGS as we flesh out the details.

Sincerely,
Meredith Michaels
Vice Chancellor

C: Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost M. Gottfredson
Assistant Vice Chancellor D. Roode
AGS President C. Dunckle
ASUCI President S. Nayudu
ASUCI Vice President S. Scifo