STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

A-239 Murphy Hall

Thursday May 2, 2013

**Attendees Present:**

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

Undergraduates: Darren Ramalho, Jas Kirt, John Joanino, Mallory Valenzuela

Administration: Kathleen Copenhaver, Associate Registrar

Christine Wilson, Director of the Graduate Student Resource Center

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

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 4:07 p.m.

**Handouts:**

* Agenda for May 2
* Draft minutes from April 25
* Credit bearing course letter
* The Chancellor’s response to the Dashew Center recommendation
* The Chancellor’s response to the benefits recommendation
* List of credit bearing courses taught in SSF funded units from Rebecca

**Approval of Agenda:**

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

**Review of the Minutes:**

* A motion to approve the 4/25/2013 minutes passed unanimously with 2 abstentions.

**Call Letter Reviews:**

* ***Christine Wilson*** suggested that, because SSF funds would not increase for 3 years, that the committee review some projections from the budget office and determine how much they can allocate before making recommendations. Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** agreed, and ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** will create several projections based on the requests SFAC has received, and the percentage of requests they could possible fund.
* ***Christine Wilson*** felt it was important that whatever requests the committee recommends be funded now, that it will be able to fund them for at least 3 years.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** asked how difficult it would be for units to cut back if after the 2 year temporary request was fulfilled, the committee was unable to continue to fund it. Christine Wilson replied that it was very difficult, especially when considering a larger percentage of a smaller unit (20% for example), because they typically do not have enough staff for the cutback to represent an employee, so employees must be pushed to percentages of their time.
* ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** wondered how many units who had been approved for 13/14 funding had duplicated their request for 14/15 funding. The committee agreed that it was important to consider whether requests were “ongoing.”
* ***Christine Wilson*** told the committee that they would also need to compare requests and funds against what Student Affairs had funded from their temporary funds the previous year. She explained that over the last two years, because a previous SFAC had been advised to not fund as many requests from Student Affairs because they had a carry forward. In reaction to this, Student Affairs pulled from the requests SFAC received that and funded them with their temporary money, which came to about $500,000 in temporary commitments, a significant amount.
* ***Christine Wilson*** went on to explain that this was significant because there would be requests from departments for 14/15 funding which looked like they were new requests because they were not being funded by SFAC. However, the programs were already in place and denial of the requests would be similar to a budget cut. The committee discussed the importance of understanding whether the request amounts included money that had already been allocated to them, plus a new request, or if the request amount only included the additional/new amount being requested.
* ***Christine Wilson*** also noted that there would be additional units requesting the next year once their funding from Student Affairs ran out. She offered to make a chart that reflects all of the available information, including which units had been funded by Student Affairs and how much funding units already have from SSF funds.
* ***Darren Ramalho*** informed the committee that his subcommittee had looked over each of the funding requests and determined which ones would be one-time requests and which ones they felt would be on-going. The Center for the Performing Arts’ request was determined to be a one-time request. The Career Center was determined to be on-going because they were expanding programs and hiring staff. The subcommittee also looked at, if it was determined that the entire request could not be funded in future years, which pieces of the request were the least critical.
* ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** brought up that one part of the Career Center request was for expanded services for graduate students, and that the Graduate Division had also made a request for expanding services. She suggested that they be reviewed together. ***Christine Wilson*** informed the committee that there are actually 4 requests that need to be looked at together, as they all relate to expanding graduate student services. She went on to explain that there has been a structural shift in the job market for PHD and Masters degrees, and the Career Center is trying to accommodate that shift by providing more expanded services for graduate students. The other two requests that complement this expansion are from the Business of Science Center and the Graduate Student Resource Center.
* The committee will review the requests relating to graduate student services together, to get a holistic view of what is going to be provided. They discussed that a possible alternative would be to ask the units to collaborate on one proposal.
* ***Darren Ramalho*** informed the committee that apart from the staff, everything else the Career Center requested was on-time in nature. The request also included a travel budget for Career Center staff to take 4 domestic trips and 2 international trips for 3 employees. It is a total of $127,000 for 13/14 and 14/15, which meant that it was not a one-time cost, but it would also not involve downsizing the number of employees if it was not funded. The purpose of the travel is to meet with potential employers and encourage them to recruit UCLA students. ***Christine Wilson*** told the committee that increasingly, students will leave California after their education, and they want to broaden national and international opportunities for these students.
* TheCareer Centeralso requested that SFAC fund an e-portfolio system which allows students to save their transcripts, recommendation letters, research papers, certificates, etc. so that they cancreate a portfolio at any point. Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** said she felt this was a valuable service.
* ***Alison Winje*** brought up the request from CAPS, which was for $2,000,000 over two years. Her subcommittee had discussed the obvious need for expanded mental health service, evidenced by the very long time students need to wait when requesting appointments, and that the request would expand evening hours and increase the number of psychologists.
* There was some discussion about the Events Office request in conjunction with CRA, which would allow them to have an office that would serve student event needs that take place in spaces Recreation manages (14 facilities). The amount of student events has been overwhelming both the Events Office and Recreation, and this request would allow them to serve students more efficiently. The committee discussed that the nature of this request seemed on-going, but that it benefits students tremendously by allowing them to schedule their events faster and sooner in the year, and give them better access to all the venues managed by CRA.
* The Center for Student Programming made a request for more student workers, and more career staff for 14/15.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** asked how CAPS was different from the Consultation & Response Team (CRT). ***Christine Wilson*** explained that CRT is distinctly separate from CAPS, though they do work in conjunction. The CRT employs 2 care managers at UCLA (who are not employed by CAPS) who are not only more able to disclose information if they believe a student is a threat to themselves or the community, but their responsibility is exclusively to intervene in crisis situations and deal with issues as they arise, rather than meeting one on one with students to counsel them. They also serve as a clearinghouse for information about students of concern, where faculty, staff, and other students can report concerns and see if they are coming from multiple places. ***Meg Babakhanian*** suggested that the CAPS and CRT requests be reviewed together.
* ***Christine Wilson*** suggested that they set aside discussions about allocating funds until every subcommittee had thoroughly reviewed their requests and had an opportunity to discover critical needs and possible overlaps of programs or job functions. The committee discussed using priority levels to sort requests, as had been done in previous years. Using priority levels, along with the discussed spreadsheet, would give each committee member a better idea of the big picture and help them make decisions about what to fund. Marilyn reminded the committee that they could also choose partial amounts of a request to fund.
* ***Kym Faull*** inquired about the request from CAPS, expressing skepticism over the amount of staff they were requesting. ***Christine Wilson*** told him that almost 20% of the student population goes to the counseling center, and this year it increased by 18% very suddenly. ***MaryTheresa Pendergast*** added that it takes up to a month for someone to even make an initial appointment if they feel they need to see a psychologist. ***Kym Faull*** asked why it was important to meet the rise in demand. ***Christine Wilson*** replied that while each SFAC member could make an independent judgment on whether or not it is important, an increase in suicides and suicide attempts should be considered, in addition to increased awareness of campus violence against others. ***Kym Faull*** replied that if this is funded, something else must not be funded. ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** responded that this is why assigning requests priority levels and considering only partially funding some requests will be important.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** offered her input on the BSC, saying that they were attempting to fill the gap between science, business, and law. One program they have brings students from the schools of business, law, and engineering together to pitch inventions to venture capitalists, and she believes that this is a very unique and valuable opportunity. ***Christine Wilson*** pointed out that a program housed under the schools of business, law, and engineering may be able to be supported by those schools, though she agreed that it was a valuable experience. Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** made the point that she does not pay student service fees to her professional school but she does pay into the SSF funds, so why is it that undergraduates can access these funds and not professional schools? ***Christine Wilson*** brought up that this program was started by the Vice Chancellor for Research, because he felt the campus needed to be more entrepreneurial. Even though UCLA ranks highly for research funding, the institution ranks much lower for the amount of money brought in through patents. This program helps faculty pitch their ideas, and if they are picked up UCLA gets a cut of that money. This begs the question of whether or not student service fee funds should really be used to fund the program.
* ***Kym Faull*** asked if this program from BSC was a class. Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** replied that it was not a class. She went on to talk about another program through the BSC that matches up new graduate students with established mentor graduate students. ***Christine Wilson*** confirmed that it was career and professional development, and as such fell within the SSF funding guidelines. ***MaryTheresa Pendergast*** expressed concern that there are so many programs for entrepreneurial and professional development, and perhaps they are all doing the same thing but do not work together.
* There was some discussion about the expanded graduate career services. ***Christine Wilson*** pointed out that career services cannot be provided to graduate students the same way as to undergraduate students, as they need a more specialized kind of counseling and service. ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** expressed concern that the Career Center request asked for an additional administrator, which seemed unnecessary. ***Christine Wilson*** replied that she helped form a committee called the graduate professional student welfare committee, and they are in the process of reviewing all of the services provided to graduate students on campus, and finding ways where they can collaborate, intersect, and not overlap. The committee is coming up with preliminary recommendations, and one that is being sent out for consideration is having a person (who might ultimately report to the Career Center) who will be in charge of leveraging and making sure that all of these graduate level resources were working together and not overly duplicative, and create and manage a network of these resources that faculty and advisors can refer students to.

**Course for Credit Recommendation Letter:**

* All 12 committee members voted electronically to approve the course for credit recommendation letter and to send it to the Chancellor.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** said she would like to add a line to the letter asking the Chancellor to please request that the Vice Chancellors who oversee the affected units be present to participate in the discussion of this issue, or consulted with. ***Darren Ramalho*** made a motion to include this item. ***Christine Wilson*** seconded the motion, which passed with one abstention.
* **Rebecca Lee-Garcia** provided the committee with a list of departments who employed staff of 20000 funds who were also teaching credit bearing courses.

**Announcements**

* ***Randy Mai*** will chair the next meeting. He informed the committee about which schools had pulled out of UCSHIP.
* ***John Joanino*** attended the UC Provost’s Meeting representing SFAC. He brought up the issue that UCLA is having with credit-bearing courses, and Amy Dorr will take the issue to OP to be discussed.
* UCSHIP was also discussed, and currently OP has not made a decision about how they are going to accommodate the $57,000,000 debt, and some schools leaving the plan. ***John Joanino*** reported that Amy Dorr said that one possible option was increasing the tax on expenditures of the campuses. Another option might come in a surcharge to students.
* David Bocarsly from USAC, Scott Arno from UCSHIP advisory board, and the GSA president were also in attendance.

**Adjournment:**

* Meeting was adjourned at 5:35PM