

UC Irvine Student Fee Advisory Committee

2011-2012 Annual Report to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

As outlined in Regents Policy 3101: The University of California Student Tuition and Fee Policy, the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) of each UC campus is mandated with recommending to the Chancellor or his/her designee on the use of Student Services Fee revenue; and the annual Student Services Fee to be set by the Regents. The Student Fee Advisory Committee of UCI achieves and executes its mission in the following ways:

1. Recommends budgetary allocations of up to \$100,000 in Student Services Fees funds to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost; and
2. Recommends ways in which UCI may continuously improve its student services and programs.

In Fall 2011, SFAC created a general agreement with the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost that with the increases in enrollment; the committee would recommend distributions of \$100,000 of the 2011-12 Student Services Fee allocation along with the unallocated SFAC permanent funds from 2010-11. Carry-over from last year included \$2,280 in unallocated SFAC permanent funds, resulting in a total allocation budget of \$102,280. Through its deliberations, SFAC chose to allocate \$97,749 in permanent funds and \$2,275 in temporary funds in 2011-12, resulting in a permanent fund carry-over of \$4,531 for the 2012-13 academic year.

The committee considered many factors in its decision-making process. Preferences were given to units that were impacted by recent cuts from general funds and also provide valuable opportunities and programs to students. Furthermore, the committee was careful to consider units that the committee felt most positively impacted the academic success of students at UC Irvine. The committee also strongly considered units that have not received major funding in the past. Lastly, the committee also took into consideration the recommendations made by Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Thomas Parham. Beyond these allocations, SFAC did not recommend allocations to programs that are not considered eligible for Student Services Fees under the UC Office of the President's Guidelines for Implementing the Student Services Fee Portion of *The University of California Student Fee Policy* and the Council on Student Fees (CSF) Standing Policy. In summary, these documents restrict funds from being allocated towards programs that are educational in nature, or to units that should receive majority funding from UC Core Funds. Through these considerations, the committee allocated Student Services Fees toward items that were both beneficial and appropriate uses of them.

Allocations

Utilizing the criteria outlined above, the committee hereby offers the following recommendations for allocations of incremental Student Services Fee funds (see

chart below). Total funding recommendations of \$100,024 include allocations of \$97,749 in permanent funds, and \$2,275 in temporary funds.

Proposed Allocations	Permanent	Temporary
Claire Trevor School of the Arts Scanner for Arts Student Affairs Office		\$190
Intercollegiate Athletics \$2,095 to facilitate additional student-oriented marketing promotions; preferably permanent funds	\$2,095	
Student Affairs-KUCI One-time funds for equipment: TFT 3320 CAP-to-EAS converter and Tascam SS-R1 Compact Flash Recorder		\$2,085
Student Affairs-Campus Organizations Anteater Involvement Fair: Facilities, print materials; and Information Table canopy rental and materials	\$1,500	
Student Affairs-Veteran Services Remaining salary (0.50 FTE) for the Veteran Coordinator/SAO III position	\$24,768	
Student Affairs-Cross Cultural Center Funds to fully fund 1.0 FTE SAO II Program Coordinator	\$9,512	
Student Affairs-Career Center Funds for 0.5 FTE Graduate Student Career Consultant/SAOIII salary	\$24,768	
Student Affairs-Counseling Center Restoration of 10% permanent to fully fund 1.0 FTE Psychiatrist	\$16,480	
Student Affairs-Disability Services Center To support 0.25 FTE Disability Specialist providing direct service to students with disabilities	\$13,626	
Student Affairs-Health Education Sexual Health Programming: Peter's Playdates; World AIDS Day; Condon Co-op; Sexual Responsibility Week/National Condom Day. Wellness Programming: Peer Educators. Pause for Cause.	\$1,805 \$1,775 \$1,420	
Total	\$97,749	<u>\$2,275</u>
		\$100,024

Course Material and Services Fees Allocations

As outlined in our guidelines, beyond Student Services Fee allocation recommendations, the SFAC is responsible for reviewing new and existing Course Material and Services Fees and making recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. The committee would like to thank you for your commitment to our values in the majority of your final CMSF decisions. Furthermore, the committee would like to express its understanding for those decisions which conflicted with our own and thank you for your consideration. As mentioned in our letter sent to you earlier this year, SFAC encountered several issues with the CMSF proposal and recommendation process. As such, we will be establishing and implementing standing policies for CMSF submitted to SFAC for review and recommendation. The committee foresees this benefiting all parties involved within the process. The standardization of this processes will allow us all to increase the accountability and transparency of the needs and requests for CMSF presented, increase our ability to best represent the student voice and to also support beneficial or necessary CMSF. Our standing policies will be modeled after the UC Guidelines for Implementing Course Material and Services Fees.

Visibility Campaign

Beyond our allocations, the SFAC found it necessary to improve its visibility on campus. With the help of Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget, Meredith Michaels, Associate Vice Chancellor of the Budget Office, Rich Lynch, and our support staff, SFAC has been able to identify and obtain an office space (Humanities Gateway 1305) for the following academic year. As outlined in the UC Office of the President's Guidelines for Implementing the Student Services Fee Portion of *The University of California Student Fee Policy*, that "each SFAC should have access to appropriate office space", the committee seeks additional funding in order to locate and maintain a permanent office space on campus. Starting next year, SFAC Chairs and Vice-Chairs will hold office hours in the space to meet with, discuss with, or educate staff, faculty, and students about Student Fees and Tuition. The committee will also make available multiple presentations made by SFAC and CSF alongside a fact sheet, to help educate students about the budget process campus- and systemwide. The committee is currently working with staff in restructuring and reformatting our website to make it more accessible and to provide more information.

Bren Events Center

During this academic year, SFAC was notified of an issue concerning the future of the Bren Events Center. With its bonds to be paid off in 2016, the Bren Events Center's referendum provides no sunset clause to resolve the end of the referenda. Currently, the referendum covers both the debt service payment towards the bonds as well as operating costs for the Bren Events Center. If the referendum were to end in 2016, an alternative source of income will need to be found for the operating expenses. If the referendum were to continue past 2016, the Bren Events Center

would be over-budgeted and be unable to reallocate its money to other services due to referendum language. Thus, SFAC has begun to establish a relationship with the Bren Events Advisory Board in an effort to find a solution. Beyond this relationship we look forward to working with you in the following years to insure that students fees for the Bren Events Center are used appropriately, and that issues such as this will be resolved and avoided. Furthermore, SFAC, as a part of CSF, has established a CSF Standing Policy regarding the implementation of student-initiated referenda that will be sent to UCOP, UCSA, the President's Council, and UC Associated Student Bodies in order to prevent situations such as this in the future.

Council on Student Fees

As outlined in Regents Policy 3101, each campus's SFAC is to serve on the Council on Student Fees. Irvine's SFAC Chair, Aaron Tso and Vice-Chair Johnson Liu represented SFAC at CSF meetings in UCSB, UCSC and UCR this year. The CSF focused on two campaigns this year:

1. Referendum Standing Policy: The CSF has established a new standing policy to guide and advise associated students and administration on drafting referendum.
2. Student Services Fee Enforcement Campaign: Each SFAC has submitted a survey documenting their current levels of transparency, accountability and sufficient funding for programs. The surveys will be compiled and presented to UCOP and each UC's Administration in an effort to increase the transparency, accountability, and sufficient funding for programs available to the SFACs.

Educational Technology Initiative

The Educational Technology Fee Initiative at UCI has been implemented as of the Winter Quarter of 2011-2012. Thus far, SFAC has committed valuable feedback from the students to the eTech committee that comprises of the CIO of the Office of Information and Technology as well as several other faculty members at UCI. Specifically, Johnson Liu is driving a new initiative through eTech labeled 'Student Technology Project Initiative' that has been approved by the committee that seeks to allow UCI students to get into a team and create a project to help the UCI community. This allows students to take a portion of the fee revenue and do something meaningful back to the students. On the other hand, eTech has already begun planning to use the funds to refresh IT equipment, provide more smart classroom features, increase wi-fi, and provide more support for students through additional personnel.

Conclusion

The committee would like to thank you for your work and support of our committee. The committee understands that many difficult budgetary decisions must be made and that you make a conscious effort to support our recommendations. The committee trusts that you will continue to make allocations in academic and student services budgets based on student priorities and needs. The committee thanks you for your solicitation of student input on critical issues on campus and the SFAC looks forward to working with you again in the upcoming academic year.

Attachments

1. Regents Policy 3101: The University of California Student Tuition and Fee Policy
2. Letter from Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Thomas Parham
3. UC Office of the President's Guidelines for Implementing the Student Services Fee Portion of *The University of California Student Fee Policy*
4. Council on Student Fees Standing Policy 2
5. Letter to EVCP Gottfredson: 2012-2013 CMSF Recommendations

April 4, 2012

Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
509 Aldrich Hall
University of California, Irvine
Irvine CA, 92697-1000

Dear EVCP Gottfredson,

As outlined in the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) Guidelines, SFAC is charged with annually reviewing new and existing Course Material Fees and making recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. This year, SFAC has received 48 requests for new Course Material and Services Fees (CMSF). The Committee feels that the quantity of requests received reflects the cuts departments have received as a result of the dire budgetary situation that is faced by the University as a whole. While sympathizing with the desire of departmental units to lessen the impact of these cuts, we feel that immoderate increases in CMSFs depart from the spirit in which CMSFs should be levied, and that these would represent an inappropriate use of this funding tool. We would like to reiterate that CMSFs should be used only to supplement the costs incurred by the consumption or retention of goods and services by students in the course of classroom / project activity, particularly those that require expenditures above and beyond the norm. We also find requests for CMSFs for software and other electronic technology difficult to endorse given the impending imposition of a per-unit eTech fee. We feel that the University and its departments should strive to obtain requisite digital resources for classes through the eTech fee so that students are not given the impression of being double-billed.

Departments which requested new CMSF include: Civil and Environmental Engineering, Biomedical, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Chemical Engineering and Material Sciences, Drama, Studio Art, Biological Sciences, Nursing, Physics and Education. Over the course of two meetings, the CMSF sub-committee presented their opinions on each of the requests and allowed time for general discussion and comments. The recommendations and comments made by SFAC from these meetings, organized by department, are detailed below.

Recommendations and Comments:

Engineering (Includes: Civil and Environmental Engineering, Biomedical, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, and Chemical Engineering and Material Sciences):

SFAC has chosen to not endorse any of the CMSF proposals made by the Henry Samueli School of Engineering for several reasons. Firstly, the CMSF guidelines state that the campus should strive to keep the increase moderate and gradual; many of these courses fees were first approved two years ago and several are now requesting substantial increases. Secondly, the SFAC feels as though it was unclear if the increases to CMSFs were necessary due to the large increases both in number of classes affected and in the dollar amounts proposed. The committee is also concerned that there are several costs included in some of the proposals that appear to be unrecoverable costs including licensed software not retained by the students, instructional and/or lab equipment usage, and some of the the labor costs. Additionally, as requests were both numerous and received several weeks later than requested by the SFAC, we found it difficult to approve the requests in the timeframe we were given— customarily, issues that we had would be addressed through dialogue with requesting groups; in this case, we had no time for questions and answers. Finally, the SFAC feels an opportunity for student feedback and voice would have allowed us to gain a better insight on the proposed CMSF. For example, the anonymized responses of a EEE survey offered to students would serve this function well, especially if space for written comments were provided. For future CMSF requests, the SFAC hopes that all departments will be timely and provide an opportunity for students to voice their opinions.

Drama

SFAC has chosen to endorse the CMSF proposal for Drama 258 - Drama for Designers. We agree that this new course will be a benefit to students by adding a necessary element to their learning experience. Although we were initially concerned for the need of live actors for the course, continued discussion with the department convinced us that this would be an effective and necessary element to the course.

Studio Art

SFAC has chosen to endorse the CMSF proposals for Studio Art 110A,B,C. Our decisions reflects that approval of students who participated in a survey conducted by the department. Student support, in combination with the fees use of purchasing necessary materials that students may find difficult to find themselves has convinced us that these CMSFs are beneficial and necessary components of the courses.

Biological Sciences

SFAC has chosen to endorse the CMSF proposal for Biological Sciences M130L. Our decision reflects that the course has a large experimental design and that this fee's 50% increase reflects the costs associated with having 6, rather than 4 units. Currently, other 4 unit labs have the same level CMSF.

Nursing

SFAC has chosen not to endorse the CMSF proposal for all Nursing Sciences Undergraduate and Graduate requests (NS 100L, NS 112LA, NS 112LB, NS 120L, NS 130L, NS 230L, NS 260A, NS 283, NS 287, NS 289). Our decision reflects the student responses from the department's survey regarding increases to CMSF. Although we have chosen not to endorse the proposals, we do commend the department for its efforts to gather student input and responses. Due to its limited size SFAC does not represent every major or school, thus student responses and input are extremely valuable to us. We also commend the Department of Nursing Sciences for providing detailed responses and comments written by students.

Education

SFAC has chosen to endorse the CMSF proposal for Education 161. Our decision reflects the 58% approval of student responses on a survey made by the department. When asked, the Department of Education was able to provide us with detailed explanations of the experiments that will be held in the classes and costs of them.

Physics

SFAC has chosen to endorse the CMSF proposal for Physics 52A,B,C. Our decision reflects the fact that this CMSF has been implemented since '98-'99, and that this request has been made to bring the CMSF into compliance with University practice. We encourage all departments to send us proposals for any CMSF that have not previously been endorsed or reviewed by SFAC and commend the Department of Physics for doing so. We hope that new CMSFs levied by the Department of Physics and other departments would be brought to the SFAC for review rather than be implemented informally.

Conclusion

We understand that given the financial and budgetary stress suffered by the University, many cuts are being passed down to the individual schools, and subsequently to individual departments. We are particularly concerned that these departmental cuts are once again being passed on to students through the use of CMSFs. As such, we hope that the Budget Work Group will remain cognizant of the expansion and broadening of various revenue generation tools employed by the numerous arms of the University, and recognize the harm done by attempts to finance University operations through the levying of an increasing number of small fees. We find that fees like CSMFs, applied unreasonably, increase the cost of education in ways that make personal financial accounting difficult for students and their families, and that these kinds of these fees obscure rather than ameliorate the problem of the University's affordability.

Sincerely,

Aaron Tso
Student Fee Advisory Committee Chair