

Student Fee Advisory Committee

October 16, 2009
Meeting Minutes

Present: Megan Braun, Payel Chowdhury, Rosemary Busta, Nidal Zmily, Natalie Goudarzian, David Curry, Andres Gonzales, Calvin Sung, Erin Kelly

Absent: Adam Van Wart, Ching- Yun Li, Sarah Bana, Stacey Murren

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

Interns: Karen Wong, Sally Yu

1. Associate Vice Chancellor Rich Lynch welcomes SFAC and gives an overview of the student fee budgeting process and the status of the budget situation to the committee.
2. SFAC's advisory role:
EVCP relies on the committee in order to allocate Reg Fees and to be aware of what priorities are important in student services areas. The Reg Fees support services and activities that contribute to student life outside of the classroom; Reg Fees are precluded from supporting instruction and research. The EVCP needs input from the committee for recommendations on how to allocate incremental Reg Fee revenue, but also relies on the committee regarding base Reg Fee allocations, including possibly redirecting funds to other areas. EVCP will take SFAC recommendations into consideration.
3. The UCI budget process:
The budget process is consultative. The EVCP directs how campus resources are allocated based on information from various resources. The Budget Workgroup (BWG) is his primary advisory group and is made up of 20-25 members including faculty from the Academic Senate, Vice Chancellors, and senior staff. The EVCP also meets with the Academic Council, Deans and the Academic Senate, and takes into consideration input from the SFAC as well. The EVCP uses input from these groups and information from UCOP and the State to allocate resources on a large-scale, campus-wide basis and allows Deans and VCs to deploy resources provided by the campus for their strategic and programmatic purposes.
4. Current budget situation:
 - \$78 million reduction in State funds to UCI
 - Plus \$15-\$16 million mandatory costs that need to be covered (Union contract obligations, infrastructure, inflation on purchased utilities, etc.,)
 - Gap partially covered by:
 - \$9 million increase in student fees
 - \$8 million in miscellaneous revenue
 - \$10 million to academic cuts
 - \$10-\$11 million to non-academic support units
 - \$6 million to academic support units (Academic Computing, Libraries)
 - \$~\$5 million from suspension of small capital improvement program
 - \$3.9 million in overhead assessment to auxiliary units (UCIMC, Bookstore, Housing)

- \$25 million from UC mandated furlough program (pay/time reduction mandate...all employees 4%-10% cut)
 - Remaining gap ~\$17 million which will be dealt with on a current basis during the year (to be covered in part by increase in Summer Session revenues, small increments from UCOP, debt restructuring, mid-year fee increases, etc.)
 - The priority is to insure that we continue to deliver the instructional program.
5. UC Regents are considering a mid-year fee increase.
 6. Some fees that students pay are:
 - Reg fee (stays on campus)
 - Educational fee (goes to UCOP and is part of the systemwide allocation model)
 - Non resident tuition (stays on campus)
 - Referendum fees are determined locally
 - Course material fees are determined locally
 7. AVC Lynch opens up the discussion for questions:
 - *How many members are on the SFAC?*
 13 total members:
 -11 students (voting members)
 6 undergrads
 2 elected ASUCI officers
 2 graduate students
 1 elected AGS officer
 -2 staff (non-voting)
 -2 faculty (non-voting)
 - *Is the mid-year fee increase for just the Ed Fee? Can the Reg Fee be increased?*
 Mid-year fee increase will be on Ed Fee only.
 - *Why isn't there a consideration that student services might need more support?*
 It would be an additional financial burden to students. Each campus, with the help of their student fee committee, has the ability to increase funding needed in student services. The need for Ed Fee increases is mainly a reaction to decline State funding. State funding is purely targeted for undergraduate and graduate education.
 - *How much is (as a percentage) the mid-year increase?*
 The proposed increase is a 15% annualized increase (half of the fee, or 7.5%, would be paid over the two remaining quarters). Annual mandatory systemwide fees would be a little more than ~\$8,000. The mid-year fee increase for graduate students will probably be less than the undergraduate fee increase. Graduate students will likely have a fee increase for 2010-11.
 - *Why did the Libraries receive a \$4 million cut? UCI has the shortest library hours out of all UCs. The concern is the space and hours not the lack of resources, and the cut disproportionately hurts students.*
 The decision was based on discussions with faculty and observation of the students' use of the new technology shows that it is more efficient. The students probably need to communicate with the EVCP; no emails were sent to him at all about the libraries.
 - *How much of the athletics such as football and basketball at UCLA and Cal help absorb the cuts to State funds?*
 The resources generated by their teams (self-supporting funds) stay in their programs and don't really help campus instructional programs. The main advantages Cal and UCLA have in regards to State funds is that they have a little more favorable State

fund allocation because of a change in the State funding model which was changed to fund enrollment at the marginal cost of instruction; newer campuses get less State funding per student. Cal and UCLA also get more research funding as well because they have had more time/history to establish research programs. However because Cal and UCLA have more State funding, their budget cuts were proportionately higher as well.

8. Discussion items for 10/23/09 meeting will include: 1) Chair and Vice Chair elections; 2) SFAC calendar; 3) CMF proposal for Engineering; and 4) Reg Fee budget survey and questionnaire.
9. It is suggested that the committee can mandate that every Reg Fee-funded unit submit a survey. The survey may be modified or shortened for units who do not wish to ask for additional funding; units requesting funding would still complete the whole survey.
10. SFAC website is in progress, yet not open to the public yet. The URL is set and viewable for SFAC members. This website will be uploaded in a couple weeks; committee can make suggestions to revise website.
11. Meeting adjourned at 2:10 PM.