

Student Fee Advisory Committee

February 24, 2010
Meeting Minutes

Present: Calvin Sung, Megan Braun, Payel Chowdhury, Andres Gonzales, Adam Van Wart, Ching-Yun Li, David Curry, Rosemary Busta, Nidal Zmily, Natalie Goudarzian

Absent: Sarah Bana, Leslie Millerd Rogers

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

Interns: Sonia Bernick

1. Meeting called to order at 12:05 pm.
2. Professor David Brodbeck, Chair of the Music Department provided the committee with an overview of the applied music program and the need for a CMF
 - Applied music is different from other disciplines due to the need for one-on-one music instruction and the challenge is to continue offering private music instruction due to the cost and budget constraints.
 - Most of the taught by part-time non-senate faculty (NSF); some are highly specialized musicians whose expertise is in one specific instrument; cost of teaching additional students and adding additional NSF can be great and the cost cannot be absorbed by additional students as with a large lecture section, or a class with 20 or 30 students.
 - Smaller music departments like UCI's struggle more than large state-funded or private music departments/schools because they tend to have the funding to hire more permanent faculty. Many music departments, even large departments, both public and private need to charge fees to applied music students to cover the cost of private music instruction.
 - Prof. Brodbeck comes from an institution that charged a music fee and wanted to establish a fee at UCI when he was recruited as chair, but there wasn't support for a fee from upper administration until the last year due to the budget situation. The aim is to begin funding the cost of the program and looked at peer public institutions. The fee proposed is modeled after the UVA fee structure, which has a blend of private/public/student fee funding and may be the direction UC is moving towards.
 - NSF has been funded with temporary instructional funds, but these funds have been cut over the last few years. In anticipation of further cuts, the music department limited 2009-10 enrollments to students studying specific instruments taught by line faculty only. At this point, the department does not know what level of funding it will receive in 2010-11 and how many students offered will actually enrolled.
 - The department will try to offset the fee increases with scholarship funds; the department has been working to try to cover all or most of fees for continuing students. Incoming students will come in knowing a fee exists, but the department will try to offset some of these fees as well.

3. Floor is opened up to questions

- Q (Calvin): What is the rationale behind the large fee level? What was the decision making process?

A: Cost of instructors can't be negotiated when they are hired at a certain step, so we don't have total control over the cost of salary. Also, funding for applied music is handled as part of regular annual budget process, including a significant allocation for temporary instructional needs. This creates a problem for a department with many NSF because the budget allocation is not always known until late summer. The department is trying to do what it can to lessen the fee for those who need to pay it. The initial fee level needs to be substantial enough for it to provide a meaningful stream of income.

- Q (Megan): How many music majors do we have?

A: Ideally we should have at least 200 music majors; we currently have around 128. No new music majors were accepted this year who would receive one-on-one instruction from NSF. But we can't continue to do this because it would change the program dramatically; without a variety of music majors, UCI will not be able to field an orchestra. We would like to offer admission to a greater % of students who audition. With CMF, we would like to begin making up the difference in enrollments starting in the fall. Applied music majors are required to take one-on-one music instruction for every quarter in residence. BA music majors are required to take up to six quarters.

- Q (Megan): If we have one oboe student do we hire one instructor to teach one student?

A: Yes. The cost recovered through the CMF would be based on % of effort (one student doesn't = 100% effort or 1.0 FTE).

- Q (Calvin): Can classes be offered to non-majors?

A: Doesn't think it would be workable and there wouldn't be enough non-majors taking the courses to solve the funding problem.

- Q (David): Could TA's teach the classes?

A: The graduate program is relatively small and we don't have enough graduates who specialize in the different instruments. Also, the graduate students not yet of the same quality as the world-class faculty they are studying with to be able to teach undergraduate majors.

- Q: (David): How can the student to faculty ratio be increased?

A: The kind of music program (applied music) cannot be taught without one-on-one instruction because we are training musicians; the nature of the program would change dramatically if applied music were not taught.

- Q: (David): What would preclude a student from attending another university like USC?

A: The price to attend USC is much higher than UCI and students in large music departments often do pay an additional fee.

- Q: (Calvin): Could UCI share faculty with other UCs (Riverside, San Diego)?
A: It may not be feasible where lecturers have other obligations as well as teaching at UCI, and I don't know how that would work, or if it's even possible. Who would decide if there is a shared position? Needs of other campuses may also be different from UCI's. What we have been able to do is to convert some part-time faculty to full-time/permanent FTE when their workload increases and if there are available FTE and funding.
- Q: (Calvin): Could a higher fee be charged to non-majors to lower/subsidize the cost for majors?
A: Non-majors would have to be very serious musicians to pay the CMF. We would also have to be very selective because the faculty would not be interested in teaching students who are not at a certain level.
- Q: (Adam): Would you be willing to admit students who are not as gifted?
A: No. We do not want to sacrifice the level of the program just to get students who are willing to pay the fee. We want to keep quality and integrity of music students.
- The department is committed to reducing the pain for current students because they didn't plan for this fee when they came here. We will do what we can to reduce costs for them, including using the \$25,000 in scholarship funds received from the Chancellor. For incoming students, they will be aware of the fee when they accept admission, but we offer them a little more in scholarships. Other institutions are facing the same problems and many will be charging additional fees.
- Q: Do you see additional increases in the next few years?
A: Not in the short term (possibly 10 years)
- Q (Adam): Would this be a permanent fee.
A: We see this as permanent—we haven't thought of this as a short-term problem, but things could change. The temporary instructional allocation has been dramatically cut in the last few years. Academic programs have been protected as much as possible with cuts to other areas like administrative expenses, but now there are not a lot of other areas left to cut.
- Q (Payel): Do you think this would result in anyone leaving the program?
A: Most students are here to work with specific faculty. We will try and offset these fees. We can't really predict what might happen, but we wouldn't expect many, if any to leave the program.
- Q (Adam): How much would the endowment contribute to the program?
A: Most of the endowment is for specific instruments. We are hoping to create a musical performance excellence fund/endowment. We have had some benefit concerts, but right now it is a small amount. This is more of a long-term project. We are trying to make a good faith effort to try to help students out as much as possible.
- Q: (Calvin): Would it be possible to phase in the fee over a couple of years?
A: Any fee increase would need to be meaningful. A \$50 or \$100 increase over a number of years will not solve the problem.

4. Additional discussion by the committee
 - Payel: It is important to be marketable in this economy; coming to UC is an investment.
 - Ching-Yun: Certain majors need to spend time with a private instructor; CMF may be offset by what other majors have to pay for in books and other supplies.
 - Adam: Keeping a well rounded faculty with who are committed to the music community and have networks in the local music community is important to students.
5. Calvin thinks it will be helpful to have students' perspectives (there is a Face Book page created by students opposed to the fee). He will see if some students can come to the next meeting.
6. Meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.