

# Student Fee Advisory Committee

April 23, 2010  
Meeting Minutes

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

Absent: Natalie Goudarizan, David Curry, Stacey Murren

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

1. Meeting called to order.
2. Minutes from 4/9/10 approved.
3. Commission on the Future Recommendations
  - a. Workgroup on Size & Shape
    - Recommendation #1: Increase Enrollment of Undergraduate Nonresident Students

Discussion:

\*The committee has some concern regarding keeping the integrity of UC education for resident students.

\*Additional nonresident tuition revenue could generate more funds to support the educational program.

\*UCSA takes a neutral stance because it may indirectly hurt resident students.

Committee recommendation: Neutral

- b. Workgroup on Education & Curriculum
  - Recommendation #1: Creating New Three-year Undergraduate Degree Programs

Committee recommendation: Supportive

- Recommendation #2: On-line Instruction for Undergraduate, Self-Supporting and Extension Programs

Discussion:

\*The committee has some concern whether or not this would provide a quality UC education and that it may limit students' on campus opportunities for research, interaction with faculty, classroom experience, campus life, etc.

\*SFAC should not make a determination on pedagogical capacity for UC to offer on-line courses; this should be left up to the UC faculty, who would not agree to go forward unless UC has the capability to maintain quality; offerings may be limited to selected on-line courses rather than for full degree programs.

\*The committee can't speculate about how this will play out 10 years down the road; this shouldn't stop UC from exploring the possibility of providing some on-line courses.

\*This may give some students, who may not be able to physically attend classes on-campus, access to a UC education.

Committee recommendation: No serious objections; straw poll: 7 neutral

- Recommendation #3: Expanding Self-Supporting Graduate and Extension Programs

Committee recommendation: Neutral

c. Workgroup on Access & Affordability

- Recommendation #5: Multi-year Fee Schedule for Each Entering Cohort of Undergraduates

Committee recommendation: Opposed

- Recommendation #6: Renaming Ed Fee and Professional Fee as "Tuition" (Excludes Reg Fee)

Discussion:

\*This is a counter recommendation to the Funding Strategies Workgroup's Recommendation #5 below to merge all fees into one "tuition." This recommendation will protect the Reg Fee.

\*Supporting this fee may send a message that the SFAC wants to protect Reg Fees from being merged into one tuition (SFAC may not be happy with changing terminology to "tuition," but committee could make a stand against merging fees into one tuition).

\*Changing fees to "tuition" doesn't seem to follow the philosophy of the Master Plan of UC being "tuition" free.

\*It is not a purposeful recommendation; this just a contrast to the other recommendation to merge fees into one "tuition."

\*Straw poll: 4 against; 2 neutral; 2 abstaining

Committee recommendation: Opposed

d. Workgroup on Funding Strategies

- Recommendation #5: Multi-year Strategy to Replace Student Fees with Tuition

Discussion:

\*The committee is against merging fees.

\*This would require campuses to budget for two or three years at a time; there may be too many variables for a two-year budget.

\*Overall UC budget situation will be contingent of state funding which is another variable; UC may not be able to react to changes in state funding.

\*There are three options for this recommendation: 1) low increases (~5% per year); 2) moderate increases (~10% per year); 3) aggressive increases (~15% pre year).

Committee recommendation:

- \*Opposed to merging fees into one tuition
- \*Neutral on multi-year strategy with low increases
- \*Opposed to moderate and aggressive multi-year fee increase strategies

- Recommendation #6: Increase Enrollment of Nonresident Undergraduates

Discussion:

- \*Caps nonresident undergraduate enrollments at 7,600.
- \*Option #1: replaces existing California resident enrollments that are above the 2007-08 budgeted enrollment targets (the state doesn't provide funding for overenrollment).
- \*Option #2: adds nonresident enrollments, but maintains the existing level of overenrolled California residents; additional revenue would be offset by additional instruction costs.

Committee recommendation:

- \*Option #1: Opposed
- \*Option #2: Neutral

- Recommendation #9: Charging Differential Fees by Campus

Discussion:

- \*This is a recommendation to study/discuss differential fees; this is not a proposal.
- \*If this goes forward, the Ed Fee funding model may change so that Ed Fees stay on campuses rather than going up to OP.
- \*UC degrees shouldn't be differentiated by campus; this could create a disparity in the quality of education based on location.

Committee recommendation: Opposed

- e. Motion passes to forward recommendations as discussed.

4. Changes to Reg Fee Policy and Guidelines – Reg Fee Task Force Draft

- a. Changes the Reg Fee to Student Services Fee.
- b. Specifies how Student Services Fee should be used.
- c. Return-to-Aid for incremental increases to Student Services Fee will be made at the same % as the RTA provision for Ed Fees.

5. SFAC Guidelines

- a. Guidelines will be distributed to Chancellors
- b. Section I:
  - Guidelines for use of Student Services Fee used CSF standing policies as the basis for the revised guidelines and were modified after extensive discussion. Language modified to add that there are limitations to use of Student Services Fees, but this does not preclude Student Services Fees being used in specified areas if they are consistent with UC Student Fee Policy.
  - Any changes to policy must be made with agreement by students.

c. Section II:

- Provides a recommended structure for and responsibilities of campus SFACs.
- Includes comprehensive annual budget review; SFAC endorsement or decline of support for campus-based fee referenda and short-term and long-term recommendations for use of Student Services Fee.

6. Campus-based Fees Governance Discussion

- a. Oversight for campus-based fees exists via boards, but SFAC would like more control.
- b. SFAC should not override the boards, but SFAC should be able to request review of annual budgets and year-end operating information.
- c. Need to consider adding provisions for sunsets in future fee referenda and/or provisions to revisit fees every x number of years.

7. Meeting adjourned.