STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

A-239 Murphy Hall

Thursday, April 18 2013

**Attendees Present:**

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

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

Guest: Glyn Davies, Academic Planning and Budget, Associate Vice Chancellor

**Attendees Absent:** MaryTheresa Pendergast, Graduate Representative

**Call to Order:**

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

**Handouts:**

* Agenda for April 18
* Draft minutes from April 11
* SFAC Temporary Funding Request Unit Division
* Temporary Funding Requests
* Ecology & Evolutionary Biology Course Materials Fee Requests
* Unit Review Executive Summary
* List of Student Affairs Courses
* Student Service Fee Implementation Policy

**Approval of Agenda:**

* A motion was made by ***Mallory Valenzuela*** and seconded to approve the agenda. This vote was unanimous.

**Review of the Minutes:**

* ***Darren Ramalho*** made a motion to approve the 4/11/2013 minutes as amended. ***John Joanino*** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**SSF Funding Credit Bearing Courses Discussion with Glyn Davies:**

* AVC ***Glyn Davies*** reminded the committee that they and the Chancellor are bound by the same policy (Student Service Fee Implementation Policy). He stated that the task at hand is interpreting the policy. From his understanding, there was funding approved by SFAC for a course in 2008 which directly funded courses in the mental health area that were credit bearing. He informed the committee that the policy they must interpret now is different, and was approved by the regents in 2010. He stated that the other contributing factor was that the 2008 decision was how to allocate SSF funding that was specifically identified by the regents for student mental health, after a tragic incident at UC Davis. A separate fund number (20002) was established to isolate that funding to ensure it could only be used for student health and psychological health services. The decision on how to allocate that funding was delegated to VC Janina Montero and her organization because student health and psychological services are their daily work.
* ***Glyn Davies*** informed the committee that in 2010 the wording of the policy changed, and calls into question the definition of a core instructional program. He stated that his definition of a core instructional program is simple: If a student can use the units to graduate, it is part of a core academic program, as the student can use those units to cover an elective.
* ***Christine Wilson*** noted that the words Glyn Davies cited were not new to the 2010 policy, but rather existed in the 2008 policy as well. Rebecca Lee-Garcia responded that in 2008 the policy did not contain the word “core” (as in “core instructional programming”), it just said “instruction.”
* ***Christine Wilson*** suggested that in some ways the addition of the word “core” seemed to make it more possible to interpret the policy to accommodate the courses in questions. If the standard of merely “instruction” was used, they would certainly count as instruction.
* ***Glyn Davies*** stated that he had determined his definition of “core instructional programming,” and it was now up to the committee to determine theirs. He proffered two ways of looking at the situation: That the policy was slightly different in 2008, and therefore the decision making was done in a more open environment, or that the lateness of the funding decision by the regents that year combined with the need to get funding to initiate programs in the new year led to all of the emphasis being placed on which programs were going to do the greatest good, rather than adhering to the policy, as the real intention of the funding was to do good for the students.
* ***Glyn Davies*** reminded the committee that the policy stipulates that SSF funding can be used for career support, and that there would not be a problem if the Career Center’s courses did not bear credit.
* ***Glyn Davies*** referenced the situation where a SSF funded employee has a 0% faculty appointment against 19900 funds. He stated that because a percentage of time spent teaching a course is written into some of the instructor’s job descriptions, that he does not consider this a possible option.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** voiced the opinion that these courses are services that offered on campus for the well-being of the students, and not an academic program. ***Glyn Davies*** replied that you could argue that because the courses offer credits, they share a characteristic with a core academic program, and can be defined as such. He stated the opinion that the basic characteristics of a core academic program are that they have been approved by a faculty, that the academic senate approves the course, and that it awards credit based on the amount of time students spend studying the material.
* ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** asked if there was a special fee for mental health (20002 fund). ***Glyn Davies*** answered that it is carved out of the SSF fee, and is comprised of a 4% increase that the regents approved specifically for mental health. He went on to state that in 2008, because of the need to identify new programs and to justify expenditures to OP in a short period of time, that the whole emphasis was on doing the right thing for the students, not necessarily following the expanded policy.
* ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** said that the other issue concerning the committee was the “slippery slope.” ***Glyn Davies*** referenced last year’s committee’s conversations about the writing center, which was determined ineligible for funding based on the fact that it was academic. He argued that if you define the writing center in the way in which the Career Center courses are recommendable, then you must reconsider the writing center, consider the library and the courses they currently put on, etc. He reminded the committee that if they come up with a definition [of core instructional program] they must be fair in its application.
* ***Mallory Valenzuela*** asked who ultimately makes the decision on how to define a core instructional program. ***Glyn Davies*** replied that it is the Chancellor’s responsibility.
* ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** asked if this issue would come up in the temporary funding requests that the committee just received. ***Glyn Davies*** replied that this issue arose because people employed against 20000 funds are teaching in the school of education.
* ***Meg Babakhanian*** asked if the courses were to remove the credit, if they would still have to reside within an academic department. Glyn Davies replied that they would not. Kathleen Copenhaver inquired about the IGR courses, and if they were acceptable because the instructors had a 0% appointment lectureship. Glyn replied that a 0% appointment lectureship is fine if the person’s job description stipulates that 100% of their time is undertaken with administrative duties. He went on to state that because 30% [sic, should be 4%] of the employees’ job description includes instruction, that this is not a possibility.
* ***Christine Wilson*** inquired if it was possible to look instead at the portion of the policy that provides flexibility and allows for exceptions, and come up with a guideline for an exception rather than define core instructional programming. ***Glyn Davies*** replied that in the context of the exception, you must look to the part of the policy which discusses the “primary focus,” and “that does not preclude some SS fees from being used.” He also reminded the committee again that no matter what they decide, they will have to apply it the same to every request, and discussed several examples of programs that could be funded under the exception.
* ***Glyn Davies*** offered the example of the library, citing the fact that during finals it stays open 24 hours for students and offers a range of stress management programming during that time, and that this is something SFAC could fund.
* ***Mallory Valenzuela*** asked for clarification, that the policy used to simply say “instruction” and now says “core instructional programs.” ***Glyn Davies*** affirmed this. ***Mallory Valenzuela*** offered that the policy seems to allow greater freedom to fund courses like the Career Center now than it used to. Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** stated that she could not see the courses in question as “core instructional programs.” ***Glyn Davies*** reminded the committee that they could not reach a definition through examples, but rather needed an intellectual structure on which to base their conclusion.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** inquired about the response from the Chancellor regarding SFAC’s recommendation to cover benefits costs for SSF funded units for 2 years. The letter was not sent from APB to the Chancellor’s office yet, ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** will look into it.
* ***Marilyn Alkin*** asked what SFAC’s role now is, and if they would be forced to de-fund the existing courses. ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** replied that their role is to define what the committee believes “core instructional program” means, and make a decision on whether or not they believe these courses are breaking or not breaking the policy.
* ***Marilyn Alkin*** asked whether this definition would be retrospective or prospective. ***Nancy Greenstein*** suggested “grandfathering” in existing courses. ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** suggested carving out an exception as allowed by policy.
* ***Darren Ramalho*** stated that he believed the courses were a valuable service, but felt that if credits were awarded to participants the instructor’s time could not be funded by SSF funds. He agreed with ***Nancy Greenstein’s*** idea to “grandfather” in existing courses as they currently exist.
* ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** asked how this would apply to the Career Center courses, as they currently teach a course, but made a request to add more. The committee discussed allowing the previous course to continue as it currently exists, but applying the definition of “core instructional program” that Glyn had put forward to the request.
* ***Christine Wilson*** felt that the “slippery slope” scenario was going to confront the committee eventually, despite the definition, but that it did avoid having to give credit bearing courses consideration in the future. She regretted Student Affairs not being able to expand the IGR programs under this interpretation of the policy.
* ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** commented that she had reviewed the IGR programs at Michigan where they began, and that they were very impressive.
* ***John Joanino*** said he struggled with SFAC deciding what constitutes a core instructional program, but does not feel comfortable setting a precedent that allows for credit bearing courses can receive SSF funds.
* ***Christine Wilson*** made a motion to recommend to the Chancellor that existing courses be “grandfathered in,” and that they put aside, for now, the issue of future credit bearing courses being funded by SSF funds. ***John Joanino*** asked if the courses were being funded by permanent or temporary allocations. ***Christine Wilson*** replied that it is permanent funding.
* ***Alison Winje*** asked what is to stop this same situation from happening in the future, of granting money to units for employees with a specific job description, and the unit changing the person’s job description over time.
* ***Kym Faull*** made a motion to recommend to the Chancellor that SFAC defines “core instructional programming” as courses offering credit, and therefore SFAC funds cannot prospectively be used to support credit-bearing courses. They recommend that this not be applied retroactively to existing courses. ***Christine Wilson*** seconded the motion.
* ***Kym Faull*** will write a draft motion for the committee to vote on at the next meeting.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** stated she did not feel comfortable with defining core instructional programming as credit bearing, since the actual policy mentions nothing about it. ***John Joanino*** expressed concern for the integrity of the Intergroup Dialogue program, and the tremendous value that it has. He is concerned that this definition will restrict the growth and direction of this program. ***Christine Wilson*** agreed with his concern, and asked if this motion would allow units to add more sections of the same course.

**Course Material Fee Discussion:**

* ***Alison Winje*** pointed out a section of the application that states that if the fee is a hardship for the student, the department will help arrange financial aid.
* ***Christine Wilson*** made a motion to approve the course material fee for EEB100L. ***Alison Winje*** seconded the motion. The motion passed with 8 for and 1 against.
* ***Christine Wilson*** made a motion to approve the course material fee for EEB109L. ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
* ***Christine Wilson*** made a motion to approve the course material fee for EEB112. ***Randy Mai*** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.
* ***Christine Wilson*** made a motion to approve the course material fee for EEB170. ***John Joanino*** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously

**Temporary Funding Requests:**

* ***Kathleen Copenhaver***, ***Randy Mai***, and ***John Joanino*** will review requests from BruinCorps, Community Programs Office, Office Technology Center, Student Affairs Information and Research Office, and Graduate Division.
* ***Christine Wilson***, ***Darren Ramalho***, and ***Alison Winje*** will review requests from Career Center, Center for Student Programming, Counseling and Psychological Services, Cultural and Recreational Affairs, Events Office, and Performing Arts
* ***Jas Kirt***, ***Kym Faull***, and ***MaryTheresa Pendergast*** will review requests from Central Ticket Office, Early Childcare, Athletics, Dashew center, Graduate Student Resource Center, and LGBT Resource Center.
* ***Nancy Greenstein***, ***Mallory Valenzuela***, and Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian***, will review requests from Business Science Center, Marching Band, Student Affairs (OP Tax), Student Legal Services, Student & Campus Life, and Scholarship Resource Center.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** provided the committee with a worksheet to assist them in reviewing each unit’s request, which tracks the program, whether it is new or continuing, the 2013/14 cost, SFAC’s recommended amount of funding, and the level of priority the committee assigns to the request.
* ***John Joanino*** asked the committee if they felt the priority system that was used last year was effective. He feels it was somewhat redundant, since the entire committee had to go through each request anyway.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** asked ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** if she could create financial projections based on which requests they are considering funding. ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** said she would be happy to do this.
* The subcommittees will attempt to review the requests under their purview by May 2. The undergraduate representatives on each subcommittee will serve as Chairperson.

**Unit Review Summaries:**

* The committee as a whole reviewed and edited the response letters to make them clearer and more specific.

**Announcements**

* ***Randy Mai***informed the committee that the UCSHIP increases for UCLA would be a 17.9% increase for graduate students and 12.5% for undergraduate students. Across all the UC campuses the increase was an average of 25.6%. UCSC experienced the highest increase at 72%.

**Adjournment:**

* Meeting was adjourned at 6:10PM