STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Murphy Hall – A239

Monday, February 11, 2013

**Attendees Present:**

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

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

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

Guest: Glyn Davies – Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Planning & Budget

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 10:06 a.m.

**Handouts:**

* Agenda for February 11
* Events Office funding request
* Draft minutes from February 4
* Forecast Summary from APB
* PRG funding recommendation
* Compensation Review letter to Chancellor Block
* Application for Compensation
* Chancellor’s Response – Student Affairs Temporary Requests
* Student User Fee Policy

**Approval of Agenda:**

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

**Review of the Minutes:**

* A motion was made by ***Darren Ramalho*** and seconded by ***John Joanino*** to approve the 2/4/2013 minutes as amended. This vote passed with 2 abstentions.

**Budget Update with Glyn Davies:**

* Glyn informed the committee that the January budget from the state gives UCLA $125,000,000 in addition to the $125,000,000 that was passed in last year’s budget, which is now a legal requirement for the state to provide for next year. The good and bad news for the operating budget is that there is no fee increase, which also means that there is no increase in student aid money. Not being able to provide additional financial aid can hurt students since there might be an increase in health insurance premiums and increases in other living expenses. What the absence of a fee increase means for the committee is that there won’t be any increases in the amount of Student Services Fee (SSF) revenue received on an annual basis unless there is an increase in enrollment, which will mean a very incremental increase in SSF revenue. UCLA is expecting to enroll 200-300 more students next year.
* The governor has made it clear that he expects there to be no additional fee increases for 4 years. He is also strongly pursuing online education, and has budgeted $10,000,000 for online education out of the state appropriations expected to go to UCLA. He expects both the CSUs and UCs to increase the amount of on-line education they offer and hopes to increase graduation rates as a result of online education.
* ***Kym Faull*** asked for clarification that SFAC would have the same amount of money to distribute for four years. AVC Davies responded that the only increases SFAC will see in their funding will come from small increases in enrollment.
* ***John Joanino*** asked if AVC Davies foresees the UCs providing more on-line courses and providing high school students with credit for them. He responded that this issue was 6-9 months away still. He went on to explain that many institutions offer these courses for free, but do not attach credit to them. If a student wants credit, they must pay for the course. He said it was certainly possible that UCLA Summer Sessions may implement this rather quickly, that there are on-line courses high school students can take at extension, but that the most difficult thing with on-line education is working out a financial model.
* AVC Davies went on to explain that while the governor’s assumption is that on-line courses are less expensive than in-person ones, this is not necessarily the case. On a per-student basis this could be true, but you need a 24/7 help desk to accommodate all of the student’s different schedules, which is one example of an additional expense related to the implementation of online courses.
* ***Meg Babakhanian*** asked about USC’s program. Glyn Davies responded that it was quite expensive, and that UCLA offers an on-line degree in engineering. It is a $30,000 master’s degree program, and enrollment in the course continues to increase.
* ***Meg Babakhanian*** asked who makes the final decision to make temporary funding permanent. AVC Davies responded that he did, and that the decision was made based on the stability of the financial environment. At the moment, the enrollment environment is very stable, and UCLA is within less than 1% variance in enrollment.

**\*ENTERED EXECUTIVE SESSION\***

*

**\*EXIT EXECUTIVE SESSION\***

**Project Review Group (PRG) Report:**

* ***MaryTheresa Pendergast*** and ***Darren Ramalho*** reported on the PRG meeting. This year they received fewer requests than they had funding for, so every request was approved and they had $8,000 left over. They distributed a list of projects that PRG would be funding. Every year they set aside $80,000 for emergency funding, and the only question stemmed from what this funding ended up being allocated to, so from now on PRG will be updated throughout the year on where the money is spent. Last year, for example, the emergency funding was spent on replacing corroded electrical panels.
* PRG gets 1/3 of summer recreation fees, a large allocation from office of the president, and then a very small amount from student fees. Each allocation is governed by guidelines on what it can and cannot be spent on.
* ***Darren Ramalho*** made a motion to accept the recommendations from PRG and recommend them to the Chancellor. ***MaryTheresa Pendergast*** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.
* ***Christine Wilson*** stated that she believed that SFAC came out ahead where the PRG was concerned, because they make a relatively small contribution to the pool of funding, but every maintenance activity or improvement on campus benefits students either directly or indirectly. ***MaryTheresa Pendergast*** brought up the point that PRG is for maintenance that goes above and beyond day-to-day activities, but cannot be counted as a new improvement. For example replacing the drapes in Royce Hall, which could cost $50,000, a larger amount than SFAC contributes, but which still benefits students.
* There was some discussion over whether or not SFAC should conduct a unit review with the PRG, though they are not a department, because SFAC contributes a small proportion of the group’s funding. SFAC currently has the same amount of oversight of the money as other contributors. Because the PRG is a group that meets once a year to decide on what deferred maintenance will be paid for from a pool of money from many different contributors, many on the committee felt it didn’t make sense for SFAC to attempt to review it like they would a department.

**Report on Meeting with Student Affairs**

* ***Meg Babakhanian*** and ***Randy Mai*** met with VC Janina Montero and AVC Monroe Gorden to discuss SFAC’s concerns about 20000 funds being used to fund academic credit bearing courses and to see if there is the possibility of moving funds around within the departments to remain compliant with SSF policy. They had pointed out that the committee had approved funding these courses with SSF funds. If the committee wants to change their mind and move funding around they are happy to go that route as well.
* User fee policy was reviewed in the meeting, and it may have a provision built in for non-core classes.
* ***John Joanino*** stated that he felt there was no other way to deal with the issue than to remove funding for all credit bearing courses because it sets too dangerous a precedent to fund them. The previous year the Bruin Resource Center had submitted a proposal that included funding for credit bearing courses, and the committee decided not to fund those courses.
* ***Nancy Greenstein*** pointed out that offering credit bearing courses as a resource center was a very powerful outreach tool, and that perhaps there was some internal re-allocating that could happen within the units so that SFAC funding was used for programs other than credit-bearing courses
* ***Christine Wilson*** said that the guidelines could be interpreted to allow funding these credit-bearing courses, but that if SFAC takes that route they would have to be very careful and create their own policy on courses to avoid funding things SSF funds should not be used for. She pointed out that the language of the policy is that SSF funds “should not be used to primarily” fund credit-bearing courses, which means it could be interpreted to mean “could sometimes be used to partially” fund credit-bearing courses.
* ***Mallory Valenzuela*** said that the way they were trained the previous year by AP&B to understand whether or not they should fund a course is based on whether or not it is credit bearing.
* ***John Joanino*** stated his opinion against SSF funding being used for credit bearing courses in any way.
* VC Montero had informed them that the majority of these courses are taught by graduate students who are paid as student workers.

**Adjournment:**

* Meeting was adjourned at 12:00PM