

Student Fee Advisory Committee

May 21, 2010
Meeting Minutes

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

Absent: Adam Van Wart, Sarah Bana, Payel Chowdhury, Erin Kelly, Leslie Millerd-Rogers

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

- 1) Meeting called to order.
- 2) CSF meeting update (Calvin)
 - a) The Davis SFAC has issues with athletics funding on their campus. UCD students are contacting their SFAC because students are being asked to cover the cost of four teams that may be eliminated due to budget cuts. UCD has a supplemental campus-based fee to support athletics and the SFAC has discretion to raise or lower the fees based on funding needs.
 - b) A new campus-based fee (“The Bear Initiative”) has been approved by Berkeley students. The fee will be \$35-\$40 for the next three to four years and then increase to \$300 per year for 20 years thereafter to support the Berkeley student center renovation debt.
 - c) UCLA had an issue regarding the campus’s intent to use campus-based fee reserves for the Pauley Pavilion renovation project; the campus will now use other resources instead of the campus-based fee reserves for this project.
 - d) The CSF budget was passed. The budget was slightly decreased due to cut in internship position not needed for next year. CSF would like to establish a contingency fund for additional initiatives, additional meetings, interns, travel, salary support, rent, utilities, etc. The contingency fund will be funded by \$25K collected from campus SFACs (~\$2,900 for UCI).
 - e) The CSF passed support for the revised Regental policy on the Student Services Fee.
 - f) The committee could not fully support the Student Services Fee guidelines because it had an issue with the language regarding the acceptable uses of the Student Services Fee; the committee felt the language opened up the ability for campuses to fund some programs that the committee felt should not be funded by the Student Services Fee.
 - g) Although the committee did not wholly support the guidelines, the guidelines will be sent to the Chancellors and the campuses will need to follow the guidelines.
 - h) The CSF will most likely be taking on the issue of campus-based fees next year to see if there should be any revisions to the campus-based fee policy.
3. Regents meeting update (Calvin)
 - a) The Regental Policy on the Student Services Fee was passed.
 - b) Vice Chancellors want to revisit list of acceptable funding areas. CSF advises future SFACs that the discussion of the guidelines should not be revisited.

4. Discussion on diversity (Calvin)

- a) Discussion on institutional aid: there has been discussion on the systemwide level regarding providing University aid and waivers of NRT for undocumented students.
- b) Diversity training: President Yudof sent a letter to the Chancellors asking how much each campus was providing for SIAP funding; evaluation of the Chancellors will include diversity training such as Human Resources diversity training for staff.
- c) Holistic admissions: Berkeley and UCLA are the only campuses using “holistic admissions” that includes numerical factors as well as other non-numeric factors such as participation in student leadership, types of classes taken, honors classes taken, the availability of honors/AP courses at the student’s campus, etc. There has been a marginal change in admissions. Prototypes based on the Berkeley and UCLA models will be developed and UCI and UCSD will pilot holistic admissions programs.

5. SFAC annual report (Calvin)

- a) Calvin is working on the first draft of the annual report. The report will include recommendations on SFAC allocations to Student Services fee-funded units (\$129K); recommendations for additional/future funding priorities, the new student fee policy, and recommendations to changes related to student services areas.
- b) Calvin will email the draft to the committee and the committee should provide input/comments to Calvin at next Friday’s meeting.
- c) One specific consideration may be more funding/resources for the Career Center. The committee could approach this two ways: 1) make a case for why the Career Center needs more funding by showing how being understaffed and underfunded has impacted students (statistical numbers), and how additional funding would benefit students in terms of specific outcomes. The committee can ask the Career Center for a one-page summary proposal; or 2) make a general statement about what student services areas are students’ priority, and what the students would like the EVCP to consider when making future funding decisions.

6. Meeting adjourned.