Approved Minutes of

STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

A239 Murphy Hall

Thursday, January 9, 2014

**Attendees Present:**

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

Undergraduates: Moneel Chand, Janay Williams, Jazz Kiang, Jas Kirt

Administration: Christine Wilson, Director, GSRC

Maureen Wadleigh, Associate Director, CRA

Nancy Greenstein, UCPD

Faculty: Kym Faull, Prof. in Residence

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

Advisor: Marilyn Alkin

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

**Call to Order:**

* The meeting was called to order at 9:07 a.m.

Handouts:

* Agenda for January 9, 2013
* Minutes from December 5, 2014
* CAPS SFAC Unit Review Questionnaire
* Caps Highlights 2012
* SFAC Unit Review 2013-2014 Marching Band
* Band Calendar 2012-2013
* Band Newsletter 2013
* Marching Band Organizational Chart
* SFAC Unit Review Questionnaire Ombuds Service
* SFAC Unit Review Graduate Division Fellowships
* SFAC Unit Review New Graduate Student Welcome BBQ
* SFAC Unit Review Professional Development 2013
* SRC Unit Review Appendix 10
* SRC Unit Review Appendix 1-9
* SFAC Unit Review School of the Arts and Architecture
* UNIT Review Facilities Management 2013
* Chancellor to SFAC re MIMG
* SFAC to Chancellor re: MIMG
* Course materials Fee Application Gown and Instrument Fee
* IEI Fee Summary
* SFAC Bruin Corps 2013
* EAOP-BC Org Chart
* CAPS 2012-2013 Annual Report
* CAPS 2013 SFAC Unit Review
* CAPS Feedback Survey Summary of Results Winter 2013
* CAOS SFAC Unit Review 12-14
* SOLE Unite Review
* SFAC Review SAIRO
* SFAC Unit Review 2013 DCISS Budget Summary
* SFAC Unit Review 2013 DCISS Org Chart
* SFAC Unit Review DCISS
* SFAC Unit Review BRC
* BRC Appendix 4
* BRC Appendix 3
* BRC Appendix 1-2
* BRC Appendix 5
* SFAC Unit Review Student Affairs Administration
* VC Student Affairs Administration Org Chart

**Approval of Agenda:**

* A motion was made to approve the agenda. This vote was unanimous.

**Review of Minutes:**

* A motion was made to approve the minutes. This vote was unanimous

**Kym Faull** requested that in the future attachments be numbered to assist in retrieving and reviewing them. There was general agreement that this would be helpful.

**Rebecca Lee-Garcia** explained the request from the School of Dentistry to raise the Gown and Instrument fee by $16, from $494 to $510 per quarter. The covers one-time use personal protection gear (like masks and gloves) and sterilized instruments for each clinical encounter. 2009-2010 was the last time the fee was raised. The application included an email from the head of the Associated Student Body agreeing with the increase.

**Nancy Greenstein** moved approving the request

**Janay Williams** seconded.

Request was approved unanimously.

**Rebecca** explained that in order for the fee to be charged starting July 1, 2014, the fee would need to be approved by the Chancellor by January 13, which was only two business days away. Dentistry stated that if the fee were to be approved, and the January deadline could not be met, then the fee could be go into effect starting Fall, 2014.

The committee divided into the following Unit Review Subcommittee’s (chairs names are bolded):

Group 1:

Units- SRC, Bruin Corps, PRG, Ombuds

Committee- **Theresa**, Christine, Janay

Group 2:

Units- BRC, CRA, welcome reception, marching band

Committee- **Jazz,** Annie, Kym

Group 3:

Units- SAIRO, Professional Development Workshops, SOLE, Center for Art Performance

Committee- **Jas**, Nancy, Randy

Group 4:

Units- CAPS, Dashew, SAA, Career Workshops (grad)

Committee- **Ali**, Moneel, Maureen

The subcommittees have 4 weeks to review the materials and report back to the full committee.

The committee will discuss the departmental responses at its 5th and 6th meetings.

The committee will draft call letters at its 7th and 8th meetings.

IEI Discussion with **Glyn Davies** –

IEI fees are paid by undergraduates and support on-line access on campus so the course environment can be accessed 24-7. Billing for the fee is calculated after the third week in the quarter when students’ study lists are finalized. The bill for the IEI fees then goes out during the sixth week of the quarter. Students are taken by surprise by the fees and must pay those fees before they can register for the next quarter.

This has been especially problematic for financial aid students because while winter financial aid awards will cover outstanding fall IEI fees, and spring awards will cover outstanding winter IEI fees, students registering for the fall have had to pay the outstanding IEI’s fee out of pocket because financial aid is not released until September. As long as the university waits until the third week to calculate the fees it is stuck in this situation.

Glyn has discussed this with others who have been unable to come up with a solution and wants to challenge the committee to come up with a solution either through its own conversation without him or through conversation with him.

He would like try to stay within the context of the existing policy but push it so we see IEI fees not as part a specific course but as part of the overall undergrad course environment

**His proposal**: If we took position that every course should have an IEI fee rate that is reduced but that the amount per student should be is standardized such that the aggregate IEI fee revenue remains the same as this year, then the fee could be added to the initial invoice like other fees such as student services fee, health charges, and other ancillary charges. Doing so would eliminate surprises for students and simplify administering the fees.

Glyn identified a **2nd issue**: should graduate courses get included in this fee?

In response to a question about the likelihood of billing for the fee if a student dropped a course or takes a course that doesn’t have the fee and if students may thus wind up paying for services they are not benefitting from **Glyn** responded with a hypothetical in which the fee is billed upfront based on a standard 12 units and pointed out that even courses which don’t have formal websites still involve multiple on-line services.

In response to a question about who would need to sign-off on this change **Glyn** responded that as long as it we consider this part of the course materials fee environment--which he acknowledged requires stretching the envelope of that definition almost off the desk--no additional approvals will be needed beyond the SFAC-Chancellor process.

However, extending the fees to graduates would mean consulting with groups like the Graduate Students Assoc, departmental chairs and deans, and Jim Davis

**Glyn** would like to return to SFAC and discuss this proposal with the committee in a couple of weeks after the committee has formulated its own thinking.

**Justin Kiang** and other committee memberswere very interested in seeing proposed numbers to understand the framework and the impact on students.

**Glyn** agreed to have his staff work up a projection of specific numbers for how this would work for the committee to consider

**Glyn** would like to see the change occur in Spring Quarter, both because fewer students are enrolled in spring quarter and because it gives us winter to work out the technology and eliminate surprises when students try to register in Fall of 2014.

**Christine Wilson**-re: stretching the definition, I’ve been frustrated by policies limiting us from doing things that make perfect sense. But I want to make sure that were not setting a precedent for having more fees slapped on up front

**Glyn**-there would be a real danger of that if I didn’t have to come to this committee and if the committee didn’t have to make a recommendation to the Chancellor. Wouldn’t want to put the Chancellor out on a limb over changes like this. There could be a dilution of control if SFAC review was not part of the process as long as it is, then it will not be diluted.

**Maureen Wadleigh**- I’m having a hard time seeing why technology is a “course material” and not infrastructure like building or heating or a utility.

**Glyn**-the only fee the Chancellor can control is the Course Materials Fee. The chancellor can approve referenda language and forward results of student referenda results to the Regents, but Regents must approve the language approved by the referenda. Other fees like Tuition, student services fee, etc. must be approved by the office of the President. The Course Materials Fee is the only flexibility we have.

In response to a question re: if this is being done on other campuses **Glynn** responded that Santa Barbara and Davis have a technology fee assessed at the beginning of the quarter. This is a service we have to provide but then you get into budget cuts, lack of state funding, tuition caps and the question is how do we pay for it if we don’t have revenue coming in?

**Discussion**:

**Kym**-asked for clarification of the request and then asked why would we object to this?

**Christine-**an objection could be that we are stretching the definition of Course Materials Fee and could open the door to more up-front fees since Course Materials Fee is the Chancellors only option for getting more money out of people’s pockets.

**Kym**-this seems like a reasonable request. Not too worried about stretching the definition because SFAC will have to review future requests.

**Annie Blomberg**-at this point grad students don’t pay any of this so if he did want to raise more revenue charging grad students the fee would be the way to do it.

**Jas Kirt**-would this lead to more classes using websites thus driving up the costs?

**Nancy Greenstein**-I think that’s an important question. In the big picture it might lower the cost for a lot of students. Everyone should keep track of their questions and bring them back to discuss with Glyn.

**Maureen**-how does Summer Quarter fit into this?

**Moneel** – Agrees that something like wi-fi is more of an infrastructure cost than a course material and is uncomfortable with muddying the definition of IEI fees. At UCSD saw muddying of Course Materials Fee as a problem. If a Chancellor comes in after Gene Block he could use that muddying to his advantage to change Course Material Fees.

**Kym** - reiterated that the SFAC committee’s review power would be a check against a Chancellor’s ability to change fees and thus the Chancellor does not have carte blanche to make changes.

**Maureen** – wants to know the impact on the numbers of extending the fee to graduate students.

**Marilyn Alkin**-addressing that question may take him longer to do.

**Alison Winje**-hopes we can see numbers next week and make a decision the following week.

Adjournment:

 A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. Motion was approved unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 10:43 am.