STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

A-239 Murphy Hall

Thursday, October 10, 2013

**Attendees Present:**

Graduates: Alison Winje (Chair), Annie Blomberg, Randy Mai, Theresa Stewart

Undergraduates: Moneel Chand, Jas Kirt, Janay Williams

Administration: Christine Wilson, Director, GSRC

Maureen Wadleigh, Associate Director, CRA

Nancy Greenstein, Director of Police Community Services

Faculty: Kym Faull, Prof. in Residence

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

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m.

**Handouts:**

* Agenda for October 10 2013
* Minutes from October 3 2013
* Course Materials Fees Overview
* SFAC Unit Review Rubric
* MCDB 150AL course materials fee request

**Approval of Agenda:**

* A motion was made by ***Randy Mai*** and seconded by ***Jas Kirt*** to approve the agenda. This vote was unanimous.

**Review of Minutes:**

* A motion was made by ***Randy Mai*** and seconded by ***Theresa Stewart*** to approve the 10/3/2013 minutes as amended. This vote was unanimous, with one abstention

**Election of Vice Chairperson**

* ***Janay Williams*** and ***Moneel Chand*** each gave a brief speech on why they felt they would be an effective Vice Chairperson for SFAC. The committee also asked them about their various time commitments for the year with classes and other student organizations.

***\*THE COMMITTEE ENTERED EXECUTIVE SESSION\****

***\*THE COMMITTEE EXITED EXECUTIVE SESSION\****

* ***Moneel Chand*** was elected as Vice Chairperson of SFAC.

**Course Materials Fee Request**

* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** presented the course materials fee request from Molecular, Cell & Developmental Biology. She explained that these fees are tied directly to courses, and that students only pay them if they take the course to which they are tied.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** reviewed the course materials fee policy for the committee, how course materials fee costs are related directly to consumables for the student. She informed the committee that her department, Academic Planning & Budget, reviews all of these requests before presenting them to SFAC to make sure that they comply with policy.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** explained the process of recommending to the Chancellor that the fee either be implemented or rejected, suggesting they ask themselves:
  + Are the fees proposed directly related to the course offered?
  + Why does the department now have the need to implement this fee?
  + Are the costs appropriate?
  + Does the feedback from students support the need for this fee?
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** reviewed the request with the committee, explaining to them why APB thought the request was reasonable and brought it to the committee.
* ***Maureen Wadleigh*** asked how many students typically respond to surveys like the ones referenced in the CMF request, and if it was comparable to the class size. ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** said there was a large variance. She asked the committee to look at the table outlining the costs for the materials and supplies, and where that money was expected to come from, to note that their revenue matches their expenditures.
* ***Alison Winje*** pointed out that the section of this course without a course materials fee is a computer based/dry lab course.
* ***Randy Mai*** noted that all 19 students enrolled in the 2013Winter section supported the fee.
* ***Janay Williams*** explained that this course is a requirement for certain majors, like hers.
* ***Annie Blomberg*** asked if there was any financial aid for students who could not afford the fee, or if all fees were out of pocket. ***Christine Wilson*** explained that the fees are billed at the end of the quarter, and if you are a science major it is likely that several of your classes have CMF associated with them, so unless you have a source of temporary money like a credit card or family members, a student may come up short. ***Janay Williams*** questioned why the fees are not assessed in the beginning of the quarter so that they could be incorporated into financial aid.
* ***Randy Mai***asked if there was an option to fulfill this requirement with a different class that did not assess a CMF. ***Janay Williams*** pointed out that these classes are offered in pairs, so while there is an option to take the dry lab/computer-based course, it is not an option for everyone.
* ***Randy Mai*** made a motion to approve the $110 fee for recommendation to the Chancellor. ***Kym Faull*** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. ***Alison Winje*** and ***Moneel Chand*** will write the recommendation letter to the Chancellor.

**Sub-committee Updates: Unit Review Sub-Committee**

* ***Randy Mai*** explained the SFAC unit review rubric to the committee. He proposed removing question #4, which asks for utilization data for SSF funded programs, and add it to #9 instead.
* It was clarified that this group of unit reviews will be made of different units/departments than the previous year, as SSF funded units are all being reviewed every other year. ***Nancy Greenstein*** suggested adding a question about current and future goals and objectives.
* ***Alison Winje*** pointed out that the previous year’s committee spent a significant amount of time discussing how well each units’ reports were written, and encouraged the committee to focus more on the content of the reports and assessing them more robustly.
* ***Maureen Wadleigh*** felt that it would be very difficult to standardize what you were looking for from responses across all the units, because each unit is so different and serves such different needs.
* ***Randy Mai*** also suggested asking units to highlight SSF funded positions on their organizational charts.
* **Randy Mai** informed the committee that they would be reviewing the following units this academic year:
  + The School of Arts and Architecture
  + The UCLA Marching Band
  + UCLA Live
  + Scholarship Resource Center
  + Office of Ombuds Services
  + Graduate Welcome Reception
  + Dashew Center for International Students & Scholars
  + Cultural & Recreational Affairs
  + Counseling and Psychological Services
  + Student Organizations, Leadership and Engagement (SOLE. Formerly the Center for Student Programming)
  + Student Affairs Information & Resource Office
  + Bruin Resource Center
  + BruinCorps
* ***Randy Mai*** brought up the topic of revealing the internal allocation of points document to the units. ***Christine Wilson*** explained to new committee members that during last year’s unit review, the units did not know how many points were assigned to each of the questions. She felt that knowing how the questions are weighted is an advantage, as you know which questions to focus most of your time and effort on.
* ***Maureen Wadleigh*** asked what the overall rating given to the units is used for. ***Christine Wilson*** replied that several years ago there was a desire to move towards a more empirical way of comparing units, to be used if a bleak budget necessitated hard choices between who got temporary funding and who didn’t.
* ***Nancy Greenstein*** felt that the empirical rubric was a useful tool for assessing the units, as it was difficult to fairly evaluate such different units with different purposes. She suggested informing the units of the point values assigned to each question.
* ***Marilyn Alkin*** asked if sending the units the points would spark questions about what they mean and what their responses will be used for. She suggested deciding on an answer to this question before sending out the rubrics.
* ***Maureen Wadleigh*** pointed out that the committee will get a somewhat skewed evaluation from the units if they send out the rubric of points, rather than a true representation of what the unit is doing. She suggested being clearer on how SFAC will use the document, however, to encourage people to take it seriously.
* ***Alison Winje*** asked the unit review sub-committee to work on drafting a new letter that more directly states what the committee will use the units answers for, and clarifying the committee’s expectations.
* ***Randy Mai*** noted that the purpose of this process will become evident as the years go by, because, as ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** projected, the committee may run out of funding by 2016.

**Sub-committee Updates: Compensation Policy**

* ***Alison Winje*** informed the committee that they had discussed separating the processes for new student orgs/committees that are requesting compensation and existing committees that receive compensation. They will be reaching out to existing committees that are compensated to determine commonalities, like amount of time, size of budgets reviewed, etc., and come up with some criteria to evaluate whether or not new committees should be compensated. They have sent out questions and are receiving replies.

**Merit Increase:**

* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** explained to the committee that they needed to decide whether or not they would fund 3% merit increases (a cost of living adjustment for non-represented employees) for staff in SSF funded positions. She told the committee that the increase would cost approximately $386,000. She asked the committee to consider whether or not they would cover that increase with SSF funds, and that there were 26 commitments that SFAC recommended the previous year, but she did not know exactly how many temporary positions would be funded. She noted that though these positions are temporary, and money would be committed for increases for only 1-2 years, these employee positions are more permanent in nature. She asked the committee to consider whether or not they felt it was important to cover merit increases for temporary positions, because if they decide not to then the unit has to figure out how to cover the increase. She noted that previously SFAC has always recommended covering these increases.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** informed the committee that, at most, funding the merit increase for all SSF funded staff (both permanent and temporary) will cost $475,000. She pointed out that approving increases for permanent employees will be a permanent allocation of $386,000, and that approving increases for temporary employees will be a temporary allocation of approximately $90,000.
* ***Kym Faull*** said he felt that because the committee had approved these positions, clearly considering them worthwhile, they are obliged to fund the merit increase.
* ***Christine Wilson*** informed the new members that in the past, when SFAC had a pretty large amount of temporary money, it generally went towards goods, services, special projects, etc. and did not often go towards funding permanent-type employee salaries. She explained that due to over-enrollment, their temporary funding significantly increased, and the committee became faced with this dilemma of funding needs that may not necessarily be temporary in nature with temporary funding.
* ***Alison Winje*** asked if all SSF funded units are apprised of the funding situation. ***Christine Wilson*** said that everyone was aware, but to varying degrees depending on how dependent their units are on SSF funds.
* ***Nancy Greenstein*** said she felt that units who requested funds were looking at the request as an expectation, rather than a competition, and those units are self-selecting what they will apply for. She noted the example of graduate student services where SFAC was funding 3 different programs that served a similar need, and encouraging them to work together and re-apply for funding when they had a more collaborative proposal. She suggesting encouraging applicants to collaborate more.
* ***Christine Wilson*** agreed with ***Kym Faull*** in his support of funding the increase. She noted that the committee would have to differentiate between providing the increase to requests that did not originally include it, and not providing the additional funding to requests that did include the increase.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** pointed out that many of the requests lumped staff members together, so it would be hard to know what was or was not included. ***Christine Wilson*** held that it would be a nominal difference.
* ***Alison Winje*** proposed voting on funding the 3% merit increase for SSF funded employees in 2 weeks.

**Council on Student Fees:**

* ***Randy Mai*** and ***Moneel Chand*** will be attending the October 18 CSF meeting at the Berkeley campus.

**Announcements:**

* ***Alison Winje*** met with Glyn Davies and will be sending out an e-mail to the directors/heads of each student service fee funded unit to express her willingness to meet with them should they want to discuss SFAC’s funding decisions, unit reviews, etc.
* ***Kym Faull*** asked if the issue they had discussed the previous year, funding credit-bearing courses with student service fees, had been resolved. ***Christine Wilson*** replied that the situation has become more complicated, and a union grievance has now been filed to prevent non-faculty from having 0% faculty appointments and the resolution is unclear. Right now the discussion is occurring between Student Affairs and the labor relations group. It appears that the academic senate is okay with non-faculty teaching as long as they hold doctorates, but not everyone who has been teaching in every program has a doctorate.

**Adjournment:**

* A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. This vote was unanimous.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:50pm.