STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

A-239 Murphy Hall

Thursday, April 25 2013

**Attendees Present:**

Graduates: Meg Babakhanian (Chair), Alison Winje, Randy Mai, MaryTheresa Pendergast

Undergraduates: Darren Ramalho, Jas Kirt, John Joanino,

Administration: Nancy Greenstein, Director of Police Community Services

Faculty: Kym Faull, Semel Institute professor

Ex-Officio: Rebecca Lee-Garcia, Academic Planning and Budget

SFAC Advisor: Marilyn Alkin, Special Assistant – Student Affairs

**Attendees Absent:** Mallory Valenzuela, undergraduate representative

Kathleen Copenhaver, Associate Registrar

Christine Wilson, Director of the Graduate Student Resource Center

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m.

**Handouts:**

* Agenda for April 25
* Draft minutes from April 18
* Guidelines for implementing the student service fee
* Career Center SFAC temporary funding request 2013
* SFAC Temporary request review subcommittees

**Approval of Agenda:**

* A motion was made by ***Darren Ramalho*** and seconded by ***Nancy Greenstein*** to approve the agenda. This vote was unanimous.

**Review of the Minutes:**

* A motion to approve the 4/18/2013 minutes as amended passed unanimously.

**Course for Credit Recommendation Letter Discussion:**

* ***Kym Faull*** made a motion to recommend, as stated in the student service fee implementation guidelines, “Revenue shall be used to support services and programs that directly benefit students and that are complementary to, but are not part of, core instructional programs.” Since “core instructional programs” is defined as credit bearing, we therefore recommend that SFAC funds not be used to support the teaching of credit bearing courses, and that this recommendation be applied prospectively for all applications for SFAC funding beginning in the 2013/14 academic year. ***Darren Ramalho*** seconded the motion.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** brought up the point that no one has defined core instructional programming, so SFAC needs to make a recommendation as to how that is defined. She recommended adding the phrase, “SFAC makes the assumption that core instructional programs are credit bearing.”
* ***Kym Faull*** moved to amend his motion to include the sentence, “SFAC interprets credit bearing courses as part of the core instructional program.” ***Nancy Greenstein*** seconded the motion as amended.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** expressed a desire to contact the Office of the President for their interpretation of core instructional program, as different entities on campus seemed to interpret it in different ways.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** informed the committee that APB and the Chancellor want SFAC’s interpretation of the guidelines. She said she believed that the Academic Senate will have a lot of say about the way the courses were set up as well.
* ***Marilyn Alkin*** reminded the committee that their recommendation needed to be based on their independent interpretation of the policy, though they could still ask the Chancellor to inquire at OP about an interpretation.
* ***Alison Winje*** said she did not think it was SFAC’s role to define core courses or discuss whether enrollment will decrease if credit is no longer offered for these courses. She believes it is SFAC’s role to manage the funds as best as they can, first within the lines of policy and second in line with students’ best interests.
* ***Darren Ramalho*** agreed that it is not SFAC’s responsibility to define, but it is their responsibility to interpret based on the information they have available to them. He stated the Glyn Davies had made it very clear that the interpretation was that credit bearing courses were tantamount to core instructional programming. He agreed that it should be left to the Office of the President and the Chancellor to define core instructional programming.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** asked the committee how they felt about grandfathering in existing courses. ***Nancy Greenstein*** said that including the term “prospectively” in the motion could be explained in the accompanying letter as SFAC wishing to continue to fund existing credit bearing courses.
* ***Alison Winje*** asked for clarification that all of these courses had been previously approved. ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** stated that the Academic Senate was asking the same question. She went on to state that the one course approved by SFAC was the Mental Health class, but that there are many other courses that were not.
* ***Alison Winje*** felt that grandfathering in existing courses would be the easiest and most satisfactory recommendation to all parties. She was also concerned about preventing credit bearing courses being funded with SSF funds without SFAC approval in the future.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** asked what specifically the role of the Academic Senate is. ***Kym Faull*** replied that it is the forum of the faculty to voice their opinions. ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** added that they would examine the academic integrity of the content of the courses, along with the academic credentials of the employees teaching them. ***Marilyn Alkin*** added that they had a subcommittee on undergraduate education that was examining these specific courses and this specific issue.
* ***Jas Kirt*** agreed that she felt it was not the role of SFAC to decide what the definition of core instructional programming, but that grandfathering existing courses seemed to be the easiest way to solve the issue. ***MaryTheresa Pendergast*** also agreed.
* ***Kym Faull*** re-read the amended motion to the committee:

“As stated in the Student Services Fee Implementation Guideline, revenue “shall be used to support services and programs that directly benefit students and that are complementary to, but not a part of, core instructional programs.” SFAC interprets credit bearing courses as part of the core instructional program. Therefore, SFAC recommends that Student Service Fee funds not be used to support the teaching of credit bearing-courses prospectively.”

* The committee agreed on the importance of including in the letter to the Chancellor their feelings on continuing to fund existing credit bearing courses as they are. They also felt that they would like the Office of the President’s definition of “core instructional program.”
* ***Darren Ramalho*** made a motion to amend the motion to include that the recommendation be applied for all *new* applications for SFAC funding beginning in the 2013/14 academic year, to clarify that existing courses would still be funded. This motion was seconded by ***Nancy Greenstein*** and was passed.
* The committee as a whole wrote the letter containing their recommendation to the Chancellor.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** pointed out that their motion may conflict with itself; since they are accepting Glyn Davies’ definition of a “core instructional program,” but are creating an exception by saying existing courses should continue to be funded. ***Nancy Greenstein*** noted that it was a very specific and logical exception, which accounted for a specific set of criteria, namely that the course must already exist and must already be funded by Student Service Fee funds. ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** said she felt it was difficult because they were looking backwards, and believed that this would be difficult for other people looking at the same issue as well.
* ***Marilyn Alkin*** reminded the committee that Student Affairs is not the only unit SFAC funds, and that there could be other courses being taught outside of student Affairs. ***John Joanino*** said he would not feel comfortable recommending that all currently funded courses continue to be funded unless the committee knows how many there are. ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** said she would perform a search of other people appointed to 19900 funds and 20000 funds, but noted that this would not tell her whether or not instruction was written into their job description. Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** reminded the committee that they would not be able to selectively choose among currently funded credit bearing courses, and would need to either recommend that all of them continue to be funded, or none of them.
* The letter to the Chancellor will be voted on via e-mail.

**User Fee Request:**

* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** informed the committee that a user fee was sent to the committee as an information item, rather than something to be voted on, because it was under the inflation rate. It is a lifetime bundled fee through the Registrar’s office that includes 4 different fees for undergraduate, masters, doctoral, and summer/international visitors. It is one fee that will allow the Registrar’s office to send lifetime official transcripts, unlimited incomplete petitions, lifetime verification mailings, lifetime third-party verifications, lifetime certificates of completion, and initial diploma mailing.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** explained that the rationale for the change was that students wish to obtain multiple transcripts both during and after their time at UCLA. Prices to mail these documents have continued to rise, and the fee is being imposed to offset increasing costs. The fee will be $165 for undergraduates, $100 for doctoral students, $80 for masters students, and $50 for summer students. Current and past students are grandfathered in. At present, students pay $15 for each transcript requested, in addition to other miscellaneous fees. On average, students will pay less with this fee than paying for each individual transcript and other fee.

**CSF Update:**

* ***Alison Winje*** and Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** attend the CSF meeting at the Merced campus the previous weekend. The Vice Chancellor at Merced came and had a discussion with the council. She discussed the challenge of not being able to add capital projects (buildings) to their campus, despite increased enrollment. There was also discussion about UCShip.
* There was also discussion about Financial Aid restructuring, including re-defining what a manageable range of student loans is, increasing work-study and self-help, and increasing tuition.
* ***John Joanino*** asked if the guidelines for how referenda should be given to the Office of the President had been solidified or not. ***Alison Winje*** replied that they were.

**Announcements:**

* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** informed the committee that the Career Center had changed their request, and advised the subcommittee to whom that unit’s request was assigned to see the attachment she had sent them.

**Adjournment:**

* Meeting was adjourned at 5:55PM