

SFAC Continuity Report 2010-11

The following report provides a synopsis of the actions undertaken by the Student Fee Advisory Committee at UCLA and our coalition partners in 2010-11. If you have any questions about the content of this report, please feel free to contact Ray Franke (Chair 2010-11) at ray.franke@ucla.edu or Cinthia Loera (Vice Chair 2010-11) at cinthialoera@gmail.com.

SFAC Priorities 2010-11 and Ongoing Campus Issues

Building on the work of last year's committee on important guiding documents, the SFAC had two main priorities for 2010-11, a Comprehensive Unit Review and the review of the Instructional Enhancement Initiative.

Priority Project (1): Comprehensive Unit Review (CUR)

This year, the SFAC undertook an extensive effort to redesign its Comprehensive Unit Review (CUR) process. This redesign impacted all elements of the review process; purpose, process flow, and tools/elements. The purpose of the review process was expanded in that it now aims to review all units funded through the Student Services Fee on campus (temporary and permanent funds) in regard to the services provided and their alignment with student priorities. We further recognized that our existing assessment framework lacked a clear and concise approach to making funding recommendations for units using an objective rubric and, therefore, the committee worked to create a new unit evaluation and taxonomy tool. Besides the taxonomy/evaluation tool (internal perspective), the committee also plans to gather student input through a campus survey (external perspective). The results from the survey and the internal review process are meant to build the foundation for future recommendations and, ultimately, alter the way SFAC approaches the entire recommendation process on this campus.

General Process

This year, the entire SFAC process was altered so that SFAC funded units would not come and give a general introductory unit presentation in the fall quarter. Instead, we started out by having just a brief introduction of all units during orientation and immediately focused on a detailed budget review for the main part of the fall quarter. The intention was, to (a) get committee members more informed about the units (through self-driven research and review of budget information with the help of APB) and (b) have more productive committee-unit interactions in the winter quarter, in which committee members can ask more informed questions and create a better unit understanding for the evaluation and assessment process. To further inform the committee members, we also sent out a revised form of the unit questionnaire.

The committee was very engaged in the unit review process throughout the year. However, due to the number of other tasks and the complexity of the review, not all planned steps could be completed in 2010-11. The following main elements of the comprehensive unit review could be accomplished:

1. Budget review of all units that received Student Services Fees over the last three years.
2. Creation of a unit evaluation and taxonomy tool to assist in the assessment and strategic planning for the use of Student Services Fees.

3. Unit questionnaire that entailed general and specific budget questions and unit presentations.

(1) *Budget Review*

The Office of Academic Planning and Budget (APB) created a very detailed report (66 pages) on the use of Student Services Fee resources. Never before had SFAC used a report that entailed such specificity and enabled the committee to review budgets of funded units in such detail.

With the help of our APB representative, the committee reviewed all budgets and created a list of related questions that were later sent out to the unit representatives.

(2) *Taxonomy and Unit Evaluation Tool*

To create a concise approach for making funding recommendations for Student Services Fee funded units, SFAC formed a subcommittee to develop a taxonomy for classifying and matching units according to Regental student fee policy and UCOP Guidelines on the Use of the Student Services Fee. From this taxonomy, we developed categories to appropriately evaluate services provided by campus units. The categorization process helps us determine which campus units qualify for Student Services Fees and how to which area they fall in (campus life, recreation, essential services, etc.). We also developed an evaluation chart and scheme to quantify our performance analysis of services provided by each unit and next year's committee will need to reexamine the evaluation chart.

(3) *Unit Questionnaire and Presentations*

In winter quarter, the committee prepared and sent out a unit questionnaire that entailed general and specific budget-related questions for the units. Units were asked to respond before their presentation to SFAC, so committee members could review the questionnaire information and prepare in-depth questions. After hearing representatives from all units, the committee finished the initial assessment, which completed the first of two crucial elements of the review.

The second element, a questionnaire to the student body (SFAC external perspective) about their perceptions of student services, is planned to be implemented in 2011-12. The taxonomy subcommittee plans to develop the student feedback survey to inform how the committee should prioritize subsequent Student Service Fee funding and will work with SAIRO to do this.

Next steps for the unit review process:

- Finalize evaluation and taxonomy tool, particularly internal assessment scores and weights
- Create student survey (perhaps use UC San Diego's survey as a template) and administer to undergraduate students
- Evaluate survey (external perspective) and SFAC unit assessment (internal perspective) and conclude review process
- Develop recommendations for Chancellor based on new review process

Priority Project (2): Instructional Enhancement Initiative (I.E.I.)

Since its inception in the 1990s, the SFAC pursues a triennial review of the Instructional Enhancement Initiative (I.E.I.). The IEI is a fee that undergraduates in The College and Engineering pay (per credit hour) for online services and course offerings. This year's review was proactively initiated by The College and an initial IEI Report submitted for review by the committee in October 2010. However, the initial report did not match the committee's expectations and certain relevant information (i.e. usage data of online services) appeared absent or was presented in a way that inhibited longitudinal comparisons across several IEI reviews.

After initial review, the committee decided it was best to redesign the entire IEI review process and create an outline for future IEI reports that could be used as a blueprint for all reporting units/divisions (see attachment). The idea was that a new, standardized way for the review would save both time and effort for all involved parties and increase the quality of the review and, therefore, justify a revision of this year's report. After discussing the new structure and review process with representatives from The College, the IEI report was rewritten and a partial draft submitted to SFAC in February 2011. Shortly after, the committee received the full, revised IEI Report (on March 8, 2011).

During this review cycle, the committee clearly distinguished between the two main elements of the review, the evaluation of IEI-funded activities in the College of Letters and Sciences over the past three years, and the request for an increase and expansion of the IEI.

Recommendations based on the 2010-11 IEI status report

After thorough review and discussion, the committee decided to recommend the following to be implemented by the next review in 2013-14:

- *Incorporate evaluation questions for digital learning environment on OID's class evaluation form*
The committee saw the need for more direct student feedback on their experiences with the digital learning environment. Therefore, we recommended that OID incorporates evaluative questions on the digital learning environment in the standard course evaluation form by spring 2012.
- *Develop a strategy to increase faculty proficiency in usage of the digital learning environment*
Familiarity with the online learning environment for faculty and instructors is pivotal for active usage. Therefore, the committee recommended the establishment of a clear training plan, so that all instructors and faculty members are proficient in using the online learning environment by 2013-14.
- *More detailed student usage data*
The committee's support of the IEI vitally depends on the actual benefits for the students. In order to fully evaluate the benefits, however, the SFAC urged the College and Schools to collect and submit more disaggregated usage information for the next review in 2013-14. Further, more context information should be provided, so usage trends can be fully assessed. This may include, but is not limited to, disaggregated numbers for unique logins (e.g. number of students that logged in once, twice, three times etc. per course and quarter), a ratio of the number of students using the online services per class (comparing actual and potential users), average time spent on course sites etc.
- *Develop a new measure for quality of digital classroom services*

In order to ensure the quality of digital learning services, the committee felt that the current minimum requirements need to be both reevaluated and enforced. To ensure minimum standards on content and functionality, SFAC recommends that the College and Schools develop a new standard for online delivery and the digital classroom services, and prepare clear implementation and evaluation strategies.

- *Submit the College's internal, annual IEI progress report to SFAC*

In order to stay informed about the progress on IEI-related activities, the committee recommended that the College submits a copy of the brief, internal IEI progress report, which is prepared annually for the Assistant Dean, to SFAC.

SFAC recommendations regarding IEI fee increase and expansion to a campus-wide model

In May 2011, the committee received a request to increase the IEI fee from \$6 to \$8 (\$1 to cover benefits increases and \$1 to fund CCLE) and have a single fee level for all undergraduate courses for which the fee is applicable. The SFAC generally supports the concept of a single fee for all undergraduate students and we also support the use of educational technology to enhance student learning outcomes. However, the committee felt that it needed more information regarding the general implementation on campus and the technological advancements associated with the increased fees.

After a thorough review, the SFAC recommended to approve the request to increase the IEI fee from \$6 per unit to \$8 per unit and expand it to all applicable undergraduate courses on a campus-wide basis. However, this recommendation comes with the requirement to submit a detailed implementation plan to SFAC by the fifth week of the Fall Quarter 2011. This plan should outline the following:

- A general implementation plan containing measurable goals to enhance the online learning environment in one-year and three-year time frames.
- A specific plan to increase familiarity of faculty and instructors with these learning tools.
- A mechanism to measure the initiative's impact, learning, usage, and satisfaction by students.
- In addition, for the Schools that will start implementing the IEI, the committee expects:
 - A progress report on the phase-in of the program, and
 - A plan outlining the specific use of the fee for the undergraduate online learning environment within the respective Schools.

UCRP/benefits Allocation for Student Services Fee funded Units

In our conversations with unit representatives and members from APB, the committee was constantly reminded of the burden of the progressively increasing UCRP/benefits contributions. The current and projected increases heavily impact every unit on campus, not only the ones funded through the Student Services Fee. Finding ways to fund the UCRP/benefits contributions, therefore, was and continues to be a high priority for SFAC. At the same time, this development provides an opportunity for the committee to engage--more than usual--in a dialogue with the units to determine the impact and necessity of delivered services for students and reflect on current and future funding priorities.

As many administrators and campus members, we are concerned about the projected increases of UCRP/benefits costs and the effects this may have on the university. After long deliberations, the committee decided to pursue a route that would provide as much support for Student Services Fee

funded units as possible, while also maintaining a financially cautious approach on our resources. Given the uncertainty in the budget projections for the State and the university system, we think this is the most appropriate approach.

This year, the committee recommended the following to the Chancellor: For Student Affairs, the benefits cash (temporary funding) shortfall in 2010-11 was agreed to be covered by reserves in Student Affairs. However, SFAC recommends that the permanent funding equivalent to the 2010-11 cash shortfall be provided to Student Affairs for 2011-12. For all other units receiving Student Services Fee resources, the cash shortfall will be funded from unallocated Student Service Fee resources and the permanent funding equivalent to the 2010-11 cash shortfall will be provided for 2011-12. For all units: increases in UCRP/benefits contributions that go beyond the 2010-11 level in 2011-12 should only be provided on a temporary basis.

In essence, all the increases in UCRP/benefits costs that occurred in 2010-11 will be funded through Student Services Fees on a permanent basis, starting in 2011-12. All additional increases that go beyond the 2010-11 level will only be covered for the academic year 2011-12, because we only recommended the use of temporary funds. Essentially, that gives the committee the freedom to decide on most of the UCRP/benefits cost for 2012-13 (and following years), depending solely on SFAC's funding situation and the needs of the units.

Emergency Funding Request (Call Letter)

Given the funding projections at the beginning of the 2010-11 academic year, the SFAC was unsure whether a call letter for temporary funding requests could be sent out to the units. After a revised budget update from APB at the end of winter/beginning of spring quarter, however, the committee decided in favor of a call letter to support SFAC units with emergency funds.

For the call, the committee decided to allow for the first time requests for contract positions (maximum of two years) that can be funded with Student Services Fees. In previous years, temporary funding requests for only one year were accepted by the committee. The committee decided to allow requests for contract positions in order to provide the units with the opportunity to create positions in high-priority fields that, in the current financial environment, could not have been funded through other means. However, the funding is still intended as "emergency", insofar that units are expected to identify other funding sources which would enable them to fund these positions themselves at the end of the two year period.

In total, we received eight requests, seven from units that already receive Student Services Fee funding and one from the Undergraduate College to establish a Student Writing Center. The seven units that requested support and already receive Student Services Fees are:

- Early Child Care Education (Administrative Vice Chancellor)
- Marching Band, 2 requests (School of Arts & Architecture)
- UCLA Live (School of Arts & Architecture)
- Community Programs Office (Student Affairs)
- Cultural and Recreational Affairs (Student Affairs)
- Student and Campus Life/CAPS (Student Affairs)

After review of the proposals, the committee decided to recommend allocating funding of \$388,088 in 2011-12 and \$179,338 in 2012-13 (total of \$567,426). The details of our recommendations for temporary funding allocations can be found in the letter to the Chancellor and corresponding attachments. On the request for the Writing Center, see details below.

Undergraduate Writing Center Request

The Student Fee Advisory Committee also received and reviewed a request by the Division of Undergraduate Education and Writing Programs to provide emergency Student Services Fee funding for the Student Writing Center in 2011-12 and 2012-13. After intense deliberations, the SFAC recommended not to fund the Writing Center using Student Services Fees.

In the discussions on the Writing Center, the committee members recognized the need for writing services for undergraduate students and believe that they should be highly prioritized. However, the committee has concluded that the writing services program is a component of the core undergraduate academic program and, as such, is integral to the academic mission of the university. The nature of the center, as a learning services program, would therefore disqualify it for Student Services Fee funding. Additionally, the committee was informed about the practice in which some faculty members and teaching assistants require students to attend the writing tutorials offered in Covell and saw this as a clear indication that these services are in fact part of the academic mission. Referring to the in 2010 implemented Regental Policy and the University of California, Office of the President Guidelines on the *Use of Student Services Fees*, the SFAC concluded that the Writing Center request is ineligible for Student Services Fee funding and submitted this recommendation to the Chancellor.

Despite this recommendation, the committee and the student representatives in particular see a great need for a Writing Center on campus. SFAC also believes that, if prioritized, tuition and state funds could be used as a bridge to keep the writing center open until other funding sources can be identified.

Talks with Judith Smith took place after receiving the Writing Center proposal, during SFAC's deliberations, and after submitting the committee's recommendation to the Chancellor. In these discussions, it has been made clear that the recommended rejection of this proposal does not preclude the Division of Undergraduate Education from submitting future requests that would clearly qualify the Center for Student Services Fee funds as long as those requests fall within the above policies. SFAC offered its support and is willing to collaborate with the Dean and Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education to help clarify any outstanding questions. As a result, the Dean and Vice Provost have indicated her willingness to work with the committee to identify potential funding opportunities.

Course Materials Fees

The SFAC is strongly concerned about the increased use of Course Materials Fees on campus. This year, the committee received a record number of nine requests (from Cell Bio, Field and Marine Biology, and Materials Science), with others that had to be deferred to 2011-12. We are concerned that this signifies an increasing trend to shift costs that are related to the academic mission of the university on a supply-based fee. Incoming committee members should remain

vigilant of this development and, if felt necessary, bring this to the attention of a broader campus audience and discuss it at the UC-wide level (CSF).

Student-Space Discussion

The Student Space subcommittee was initiated by Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Janina Montero and facilitated by Robert Williams (ASUCLA Director) and Mick DeLuca (Director of Cultural and Recreational Affairs) to provide student space needs on the UCLA Long Term Capital planning the University undergoes every 10 years. The SFAC appointed representative sat with various student representative groups such as Student Activities Center Board of Governors (SACBOG), The Undergraduate Student Association Council Facilities Commissioner, etc. Due to the wide range of student representation finding a meeting time was difficult and for a majority of the meetings in fall and Winter Quarter there was not full representation. In Spring Quarter the committee hired the consultant firm Brailsford and Dunlavey based on its experience working with various Universities across the United States. Early in the Quarter it conducted various random focus groups of UCLA students in order to hone in on student space needs. These focus groups included, out of state, international, student group members, performance groups, etc. It is currently in the comparative data collection phase as they move towards a completed report for our UCLA Student Space Needs and Utilization Study. The follow up meeting will most likely occur on Tuesday June 21st, for a preliminary presentation of the findings. SFAC will be sending Chair-Elect Cinthia Loera as the new representative for 2011-12.

Project Review Group (PRG)

Two SFAC members attended the PRG meeting this year. Fortunately the meeting was brief because all of the projects were within the budget for the year. At the meeting everyone went over the projects proposed for the following year and reviewed their budgets. All of the budgets were determined appropriate and fiscally responsible thus they were all approved.

Other

Student Mental Health Funding

The SFAC continues to have funding available for Student Mental Health. With further increases in the stresses experienced by students and the number of students in need for mental-health related support (in our conversations with CAPS and other units, we were informed about the steady increase over the past years in the number of students experiencing mental-health related issues), the committee would like to renew its encouragement for the incoming committee to expand the scope of SMHI funding areas. Further, the incoming committee should consider working more closely with Student Affairs on plans as to how Tier 3 needs can be addressed and unallocated SMHI funding used for respective initiatives.

Student Affairs Reorganization

Since the financial crisis and the related cuts to higher education in general and the UC system in particular, Student Affairs has been contemplating to reorganize units within the organization. This has been largely done behind the scenes and coordinated within the Executive Management Group. Initially, VC Montero agreed to keep SFAC informed about the progress of the

reorganization. However, after initial talks in August 2010, no further information was revealed. The incoming Chair should consider to what extent SFAC should be informed about the planned reorganization and how information processes should be designed between SA and the committee.

Council and Student Fees (CSF) and UC-wide Issues

This year, the Council on Student Fee's had various priorities, for instance to increase the visibility of individual SFAC's and the CSF, amend governing documents, professional/miscellaneous campus fees, and funding streams at the UC.

Other campuses were very successful in their visibility campaigns and attempts were made to standardize certain elements and tools so that all campuses could benefit from these efforts. UCLA should make more use of such tools in the future.

CSF also discussed the new funding stream proposal that has been voted to be implemented by the Regents. This proposal changes the entire flow of funds between individual campuses and UCOP and has various influences and a far-reaching impact. However, after discussing details with APB, most of the impact will be felt in 2012-13.

An important factor is, however, that student voices will be incorporated into the implementation process of the funding stream proposal. As alterations of funding streams also affect student referenda, miscellaneous fees and pretty much every other fee student pay on campus, this is of high priority.

The SFAC Vice Chair attended the Council on Student Fee's meeting in San Francisco during Spring quarter. At the meeting the Council amended the charter, standing policies, and bylaws. They also spoke about issues concerning the campuses such as benefit costs, rising tuition, and council visibility. The council decided that they would continue their visibility campaign on all campuses. The council also decided that it was necessary for there to be a CSF orientation before the first CSF meeting to better prepare members for the incoming years. Lastly, the new CSF chair was chosen by the council. The incoming chair for the CSF is Michelle Greenwood a graduate student from UC Merced.

Attachment A – Recommended IEI report structure and process (as of 3/2011)

Template for Review Process:

- Step 1: College of Letters and Science send the Template to the Departments
Deliver template in Spring prior in time for a Fall report
- Step 2: SFAC receives an overview of the IEI in the Fall
- Step 3: SFAC receives an overview of the Previous Reviews
- Step 4: Presentation on Current Review
- Step 5: SFAC Begins review in Fall and Completes Review by Winter

Template for IEI Review:

Part 1: Overview of Department and IEI Fee Use

- Please provide an overview of your function?
- Please provide an organization chart of the functions, units, etc. supported by the IEI fee.
- Please provide an overview of fee use.
 - Please describe and distinguish between the units, programs, workgroups, committees and services funded by the IEI (please describe acronyms)?
 - Please discuss the headcount and the number of FTE, consultants, students and others employed by the department whose time is funded from IEI?
 - Please describe how undergraduates and graduates are supported by the IEI (do not include statistical uses at this time).
 - Please also describe how you advertise to students.
- Please provide a list of examples of notable class websites supported by the IEI.

Part 2: Use of Fees

- Please describe in detail the multiple sources of funding that support Instructional Enhancement activities within your department (Include financial data in the financial statements section)?
- Describe the source, amount and term (time) of the funding.
- Please discuss how you conform to the UCOP guidelines?
- Please discuss your plans to seek alternative funding sources.

Part 3: Student Input

- Please describe how you solicit student input on your use of the IEI.
- Student Surveys (Aggregated Data)
 - Please describe how you assess whether or not students benefit from services provided by the IEI.
 - Please discuss how the IEI contributes to student learning.

Part 4: Performance Criteria: Statistical and Utilization Reports

- Please describe methodology for collecting data.
- Please complete the attached usage template (by percentage of students using)
 - Total Classes
 - Total Sites
 - Discussion Board Use

- Please provide the total number of students in the department versus the total number of students who use services supported by IEL.
 - This includes the numbers of students who use labs, software, take courses, use websites and provide support.
- Please provide the percentage of professors who are adequately trained in the use of online services funded by the IEL.
- Please provide the percentage of professors who use the services funded by the IEL.
- Please provide the percentage of students who use online services funded by the IEL.
 - Please provide description on a total and per site basis.
- Please provide the usage statistics for labs funded by the IEL.
 - If possible, please identify the number of students who are charged the IEL fee and use the lab.

Part 5: Financial Statements

- Please complete the attached financial report (refer to 2006-2007 review)
 - Current Allocation
 - Current Expenditures
 - Projected Appropriation
 - Please provide the assessment level
- Please discuss the fee assessment mechanisms for all units supported by the IEL.

- Please discuss how the fee impacts financial aid for students.
- Please discuss the criteria used to assign fee income to specific units.
- Please provide the amount the average student pays in IEL fees per quarter for your department.

Student Space Subcommittee 2010-11

The Student Space subcommittee was initiated by Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Janina Montero and facilitated by Robert Williams (ASUCLA Director) and Mick DeLuca (Director of Cultural and Recreational Affairs) to provide student space needs on the UCLA Long Term Capital planning the University undergoes every 10 years. The SFAC appointed representative sat with various student representative groups such as Student Activities Center Board of Governors (SACBOG), The Undergraduate Student Association Council Facilities Commissioner, etc. Due to the wide range of student representation finding a meeting time was difficult and for a majority of the meetings in Fall and Winter Quarter there was not full representation. In Spring Quarter the committee hired the consultant firm Brailsford and Dunlavey based on its experience working with various Universities across the United States. Early in the Quarter it conducted various random focus groups of UCLA students in order to hone in on student space needs. These focus groups included, out of state, international, student group members, performance groups, etc. It is currently in the comparative data collection phase as they move towards a completed report for our UCLA Student Space Needs and Utilization Study. The follow up meeting will most likely occur on Tuesday June 21st, for a preliminary presentation of the findings. SFAC will be sending Chair-Elect Cinthia Loera as the new representative for 2011-12.