STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

A-239 Murphy Hall

Thursday, April 4 2013

**Attendees Present:**

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

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

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 p.m.

**Handouts:**

* Agenda for April 4
* Draft minutes from March 11
* Unit review executive summary
* Compensation policy response to Chancellor Block
* POSSSE New fund application – DCISS
* UCLA student user fee policy
* Student affairs list of courses
* Chancellor’s letter regarding student compensation
* UCLA SFAC compensation policy
* Application for compensation
* Compensation review letter to Chancellor Block

**Approval of Agenda:**

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

**Review of the Minutes:**

* A motion to approve the 3/11/2013 minutes as amended passed unanimously.

**User Fee Request:**

* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** presented the user fee request from the Dashew Center. She informed the committee that these fees apply only to voluntary users of specific programs or services at UCLA. In this case, only those students who voluntarily utilize a program or service at the Dashew Center would be subject to the onetime fee associated specifically with the cost of that program or service.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** went on to inform the committee that if it is just an increase in a fee that does not exceed the rate of inflation, it comes to the SFAC as an informational item after it is approved. If it is a new fee, SFAC needs to be involved in the process by recommending to the Chancellor that it either be approved or not approved. Institution of the fee will also require APB’s approval.
* ***Christine Wilson*** and ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** clarified that approving this fund will just give DCISS the ability to charge fees for optional events and activities. For example, if they are providing tickets and transportation to a baseball game as part of an acculturation program, they could charge a nominal fee to the participating students to offset the cost.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** pointed out to the committee that the department will not make money on these sales and service fees, the point of the account and the fees is to help them break even on special programs.
* ***Christine Wilson*** informed the committee that DCISS has charged these fees for programs, trips, and events in the past, but a student group had been in charge of collecting the fees and paying for the necessary transportation, etc. because they did not have a sales and service account. Setting up this account will allow them to handle the collection of funds and payment for programs themselves.
* ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** made a motion to recommend to the Chancellor that DCISS be able to set up a sales and service fund to charge voluntary fees for certain programs and events. Darren Ramalho seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** will write a letter to the Chancellor recommending the approval of the sales and service fund for DCISS.

**Credit Course Discussion:**

* The committee reviewed the list of credit bearing courses taught in various student affairs departments, and also the answers to the questions they had posed to AVC Gorden regarding these courses.
* ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** clarified for the committee that none of these courses are general education courses. She went on to state that the courses have all gone through the appropriate channels be approved as courses, and that SFAC’s role is to now decide whether or not instruction for these courses can funded by student service fee funds. She confirmed that they do not satisfy major or general education requirements, but rather count as elective units.
* ***Mallory Valenzuela*** stated the opinion that she did not believe the courses were detrimental to the funding decisions SFAC makes or has made.
* ***Christine Wilson*** had prepared a draft of a set of guidelines SFAC could use to fund these types of courses if they wished to continue to do so. She outlined the commonalities amongst the currently funded courses that differentiate them from other courses. She made the point that these courses are not state funded. She told the committee that she would like to see funding for these courses continue, but that strict guidelines will be essential to ensure that funding for credit bearing courses stays within the confines of policies that govern student service fee funds.
* ***Christine Wilson*** pointed out that all of these courses are geared toward retention and mental health, which fall under the purview of Student Affairs. They do not exist to help students build competency in a certain field, but rather they assist students to function in a way that will help them be successful at the university. She noted that the policy seems to intentionally leave itself open to interpretation, and that the current UCLA SFAC interpretation of that policy allows these courses to be funded.
* ***Mallory Valenzuela*** voiced her support in favor of the draft guidelines Christine Wilson had distributed, and of making the policy clearer regarding courses that can and cannot be funded.
* ***Kym Faull*** asked what would happen if these courses were not funded by student service fees. ***Christine Wilson*** replied that they would no longer exist as courses. ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** pointed out that they could still be funded without credit attached to them, and that attendance is not an Academic Senate approved reason for a course to become credit bearing. ***Christine Wilson*** pointed out that these courses had already been approved by the Academic Senate.
* ***Kym Faull*** asked if interest in the courses would diminish if they were no longer credit bearing. ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** replied that it probably would, but that this is not a valid reason to have a course on a transcript.
* ***Nancy Greenstein*** asked how the courses were evaluated to determine whether or not they are serving the purpose they are supposed to for the students who take the class. She pointed out that evaluation was an important aspect of the recent unit reviews, and that it should be an important component of these courses if they continue to be funded.
* ***Alison Winje*** voiced the opinion that some of these courses may be redundant when considering all of the programs that address various issues such as body image, life skills, etc.
* There was some discussion about the intergroup dialogue courses, and ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** pointed out that course approval has been delegated to the schools now, so these courses have been vetted by the schools but not the undergraduate council.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** shared with the committee that she and ***Randy Mai*** had spoken with the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs about which courses would be cancelled if SFAC made the decision to longer fund them. All of the Career Center courses would have to be cancelled as courses. There was some discussion about how the material could still be presented in workshops, but not for credit, if that decision was made.
* ***Alison Winje*** asked if it would be possible to approve courses on the condition of satisfactory evaluation of effectiveness. ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** informed the committee that these courses are already evaluated by the standard teaching evaluation. ***Alison Winje*** and ***Christine Wilson*** asserted that the units could be asked to evaluate the courses independently of the academic senate.
* ***John Joanino*** voiced the opinion that if people are taking these courses and the units are needed to incentivize them, then it no longer seems like a service.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** reminded the committee that they are not funding the courses; they are funding the people who teach the courses as a small percentage of their job duties.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** asked the committee if they would like to speak to Student Affairs administration before making a final decision on whether or not to fund these courses.
* ***John Joanino*** asked if the funding of the staff who teach these courses could be traced back to any particular funding requests. ***Marilyn Alkin*** replied that this was not possible, since SFAC makes the decision to fund a unit for staff positions, and then the unit can decide at their discretion to write the specifics of the staff member’s job description. ***Christine Wilson*** pointed out that these are existing positions, staff members who dedicate the majority of their time to other things, but that part of their job description includes teaching these courses, which happen to be credit bearing.
* ***Mallory Valenzuela*** said she felt that the next step would be to talk to Vice Chancellor Montero as a committee. She informed the committee that she facilitates an internship course, and there are no units offered, but that people still attend.

**Compensation Policy:**

* ***John Joanino*** informed the committee that Chancellor Block had sent back some questions in response to the letter SFAC sent him regarding the compensation policy. He believes the confusion stemmed from a belief that SFAC had re-written the compensation policy, rather than simply expanding it to include an application process for potential new committees. They clarify this point in their return communication.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** said that Glyn Davies also had a few questions regarding the criteria for new committees applying to receive compensation. She requested more specific information on the exact criteria and percentages that will make a committee eligible to receive funding.
* ***John Joanino*** replied that the subcommittee had broken it down to three different levels according to how many hours they spent working on the committee, the amount of the budget they review, and their level of interaction with administration.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** replied that currently the criteria for who is eligible to apply are not clear, and that the metrics need to be more specific. She pointed out that the actual application does not include precise numbers for anything, and that right now it seems open to any groups on campus who might like to apply for compensation. She also said that the letter they sent to the Chancellor did not refer to the existing policy.
* ***John Joanino*** informed the committee that some other concerns addressed by the Chancellor include whether or not SFAC will raise the cap on how much compensation committees can receive. He walked the committee through the letter that was written in response to his questions. ***Kym Faull*** suggested addressing his questions bullet by bullet.
* ***Mallory Valenzuela*** asked if the new metric system would also apply to existing committees that are already being compensated by SFAC, and if this would create a new evaluation process for all of the committees.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** pointed out to the committee that they will eventually have to justify why they assigned a certain dollar amount to a certain committee.
* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** recalled a conversation from the previous year with Layhearn Tep about setting too narrow of guidelines for committee compensation, because every committee does such different work.
* ***John Joanino*** asked if APB would be comfortable giving this kind of flexibility to SFAC to evaluate the compensated committees. ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** re-iterated that while the committees can be evaluated in different ways, there must be certain baselines so that the decisions SFAC makes can be explained and can be fair.
* ***Mallory Valenzuela*** brought up the fact that these guidelines would not be retroactively applied to committees that already receive funding, which may be a double standard. Kathleen Copenhaver pointed out that there seemed to be an existing framework within the existing compensation policy that could be used for the application process. Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** suggested using the metrics of the committees that are already compensated as baselines for new committees wishing to apply. For example, take the range of total number of hours worked of all of the existing committees and establish this as the acceptable range.
* ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** asked the committee what the most important factor was when deciding whether or not a committee deserved compensation. SFAC members seemed to generally agree that percentage of time was the most important factor.
* ***John Joanino, Jas Kirt*,** and ***Randy Mai*** will form a subcommittee to create qualifying baselines for compensation.

**Unit Review Summaries**

* Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** asked the committee the review the letters to each unit thanking them for and giving them feedback on their answers to the unit review questionnaires. ***Kathleen Copenhaver*** suggested that ***Meg Babakhanian*** needs to edit each letter in a way that makes it more specific to the unit. ***MaryTheresa Pendergast*** suggested that ***Meg Babakhanian*** write one general letter format thanking the units, and that each unit review subcommittee fill in the pertinent details for the units they were responsible for.

**CSF Meeting**

* ***Randy Mai*** will be unable to attend the next CSF meeting, which is on April 20th at the UC Merced campus. Chairperson ***Meg Babakhanian*** asked the committee members if they would like to attend.

**Announcements**

* ***Meg Babakhanian***informed the committee of a budget briefing with the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs that she had attended. One of the main concerns of the discussion was that tax dodging may negatively affect the amount of revenue generated from Prop 30. There was also some discussion about on-line courses, and ***Meg Babakhanian*** informed the committee that an advisory group of students will be formed to give their thoughts on on-line learning.
* ***Christine Wilson*** asked if this applied only to on-line programs, or to all self-supporting programs, citing a big push towards these kinds of programs in light of budget deficits. ***Meg Babakhanian*** responded that the concern was only regarding on-line programs, and whether or not they could effectively convey the material they are supposed to.
* ***Randy Mai*** informed the committee that for those who are in professional degree programs, there is still potentially going to be an increase in supplementary tuition, but it will not be voted on until July, to take effect in the Fall.
* There was some discussion among the committee about making a recommendation to the Chancellor to hire a student worker to scan and archive SFAC documents. The committee as a whole decided against this, as many things are already on-line, but that archives will be established moving forward. The committee will work with OTC to configure an archiving method.

* ***Randy Mai*** informed the committee that he explained to SHAC that a committee cannot receive funding from two sources and retain their compensation from SFAC. They have decided instead to become affiliated with a new student organization.

**Adjournment:**

* Meeting was adjourned at 5:45PM