

Student Fee Advisory Committee

April 9, 2010
Meeting Minutes

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

Absent: Leslie Millerd Rogers

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

1. Meeting called to order at 11:11 am
2. Minutes from March 10, 2010 meeting approved.
3. Commission on the Future Update
 - a. Calvin reviewed and selected recommendations relevant to the committee and student fees. The committee should review and provide comments for the next meeting.
 - b. Discussion on recommendations

- Recommendation: Increase the number and proportion of nonresident students to resident students at the undergraduate level to generate additional revenues to be used for enhancing the educational experience for all students.

Discussion: the committee's main concern is that the increase in nonresident students does not impact access for California residents.

- Recommendation: 1) Increase the proportion of undergraduate students graduating in four years or less; 2) creating three-year undergraduate degree for a select few students from the freshman class in specific majors chosen by the Academic Senate (i.e., a few Humanities and Social Sciences degrees). This will be more intense, accelerated courses and may include required summer session attendance and full use of AP/honors credits. New streamlined major program may be created. There may be priority enrollment and financial incentives for students who select the three-year option. There could be savings for students/families (~\$20K), savings for campuses as well because of more efficient use of resources and better management of curriculum, and increased access to UC education because campuses will be able to accommodate more students.

Discussion: the committee expresses concern that there will be an impact on the quality of education and students not being able to fully take advantage of the campus experience/student life.

- Recommendation: Exploration into providing on-line courses for undergraduate curriculum, self-supporting and Extension programs.

Discussion: the committee has concern regarding quality of on-line courses, testing capacity, effects on accreditation, and pedagogical issues.

- Recommendation: Expanding use of self-supporting and part-time programs to generate revenue, and meet student needs in high-demand programs and underserved communities needs. Anticipated benefits include increased revenue, self-paying costs and increased capacity or increased number of programs to meet demand.
- Recommendation: Adopt a multi-year fee schedule for each entering class of undergraduate students. This would guarantee fixed fee increase rates and give students and their families a greater ability for financial planning.

Discussion: the committee feels this will be a trade off between cost and quality of the education program. Having safe guards in place in theory a good idea, but students commit to UC with an understanding they will receive a degree of quality and the quality of education might decrease because of less flexibility for UC to respond to cuts in State funding. On the other hand, students and families need stability for financial planning. This could be meaningless if the Regents feel exceptions might be needed and break the cap. This would place the burden of fee increases on only 30% of the u/g student population. If fee increases are only for freshmen, what motivates other students from caring about increases to incoming classes? This may give the Regents too much leeway to increase fees for students who do not have advocates against fee increases.

- Recommendation: Renaming Educational Fee and the Professional Degree Fees (not Registration Fee) as “tuition”. Ed Fee and Professional Fees are the equivalent of tuition (in use and general understanding by the public) and support core instructional expenses in contrast to the non-instructional student programs and services supported by the Reg Fee.
- Recommendation: Creating a multi-year strategy to replace student fees with tuition. This would be a multi-year fee plan for all students (not by class), and would merge Ed and Reg Fee into one tuition. This will take several years to implement.

Discussion: The committee is concerned that there will be less funding for student services and more funding for academics. This appears to be a grass roots effort from the Santa Barbara EVCP and UCLA’s Planning and Budget Vice Chancellor. President Yudof and Chancellor Drake support separation. President Yudof wants to maintain transparency and separation of student fees. This is a counter recommendation/argument to access and affordability. EVCP has not explicitly said he supports one tuition fee,

- There is another recommendation similar to recommendation #1 regarding nonresident enrollments for undergraduates. This is a recommendation submitted from another sub-group of the Working Group.
- Recommendation: charging differential tuition by campus. There was a backlash from students and the language was changed to “allow for possibility” of charging differential tuition by campus. This will be delayed for another year to allow for more review. There is a two-tier model where the first tier would include all campuses except Riverside, Merced, and Santa Cruz (who would be in the second tier). And there is a three-tier model where UCLA, and Berkeley would be in tier 1; Davis, Irvine, San Diego and Santa Barbara would be in tier 2; and Riverside, Merced and Santa Cruz would be in tier 3. The difference between tiered affect and 30% increases to student fees over multiple years (five year increase to ~\$40K per

student) is nominal over five years (~\$96M). OP would probably still control Educational Fee. Average amount of Ed Fees (or total funding?) per student systemwide is ~\$17K; UCI gets about \$14K per student; Berkeley gets +\$19K per student; UCLA gets about \$19K ; Davis gets about \$18K; other campuses get under \$17K.

4. New U Referendum

- a. The New U proposes a campus-based student fee initiative which was presented to the undergraduate Legislative Council at the end of last quarter because it needed to get approved by week 10 of the winter quarter. The initiative has been submitted for the Chancellor's signature and VC Gomez has recommended that the Chancellor approve the initiative, and must also pass through SFAC.
- b. The proposed initiative includes:
 - \$2 per undergraduate student per quarter
 - Fall 2010 implementation and will only be assessed for the fall, winter and spring quarters.
 - 33% return-to-aid provision
 - Income managed by New U to cover publication costs.
- c. In order to be official 60% of 25% (approximately 6K) of the undergraduate student population must vote yes.
- d. Infrastructure for New U is already in place. The fee would provide approximately \$80K in revenue for perpetuity; there is no provision to adjust the fee for CPI which might be good for flexibility since cost structure may change. Santa Barbara has a student assessment which includes a subsidy to their student paper; it is not known if Berkeley and/or UCLA have a fee to subsidize their daily student papers.
- e. Committee votes to recommend initiative for ASUCI ballot: In favor = 9; Against = 0; Abstaining = 0. Motion passes.

5. UC Regents Meeting Update (Calvin)

- a. Provost Pitts and President Yudof support separation of fees. The recommendation to the Regents will come from Commission. VP Brostrom and VP Lenz support of Reg Fee. And Chancellor Drake is also supportive of the Reg Fee. The proposal to combine the Ed and Reg Fees most likely will not pass in the next few years; but it may be approved in future years. Committee feels that it is understandable to revisit the policy in future years.
- b. Committee feels if fees are merged, student services will be significantly compromised depending on the priorities of campus leadership. The committee also feels merging the two fees would disproportionately affect undergraduates and students would not be able to have input on student programming which would impact students' quality of life.

6. Proposed Increase to Reg Fee to Support Outreach and Diversity

a. As a result of UCSD incident (and other incidents); Jesse Bernal proposed to raise Registration Fee for fall 2010 by ~\$30 with the increase to be earmarked for student outreach programs to increase diversity.

b. Discussion:

- The committee does not believe plan for programs has been established, so there is concern on how would campus manage programs and funds.
- The committee believes programs need to be made mandatory and directed at specific students who have tolerance issues---that might not be possible, in order to be effective.
- There are already measures in place (student initiated outreach program), but will putting in more funding for these programs be helpful?
- Options: 1) permanent increase specifically for outreach; 2) permanent increase with increases reallocated to SFACs for future funding recommendations; 3) temporary increase only; 4) cost sharing (matching) between state and students.
- Regents have already made a “statement” against Reg Fee increases for 2010-11.
- This might set a bad precedent when something bad happens on campuses; students will be taking measures to fix issues rather than campus administrations taking action.
- Calvin will speak with both Jesses (Bernal and Cheng) regarding next steps.

7. Audit

a. Discussion:

- Committee needs to determine methodology; perhaps ask Internal Audit to visit to get guidance in terms of what to look for. (i.e., look at patterns of spending).
- Committee needs to determine areas of interest; what to look for; what to include in audits; what to ask for. Committee should look at student needs and where efforts and funds are directed. Need student survey.
- Committee should be aware of time commitments when regarding requests for departments. The committee should ask for documentation in hand and not create a lot of additional requests. Committee should be prepared and be clear about what it needs from departments and what it is looking at.

8. Meeting adjourned.