

**University of California San Francisco
CHANCELLOR'S STUDENT SERVICES FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Meeting Minutes
January 24, 2022

Members Present: Woodger Faugas (Chair), Gurbinder Singh, Jeanmarie Gonzalez, Jane Vosteen, Nam Nguyen, Hoang Dang, Leila Lu, Diana Do, Alina Luk, Cody Stroupe

Faculty Present: Jennifer Kinder (Chair)

Ex-Officio Members Present: Jennifer Mannix, Alece Alderson

Staff Present: Jennifer Rosko, Matthew Tout, Taylor Mayfield

Absent: Claire Ogee-Nwankwo

- 1. Welcome & Introductions:** Woody opened with an introduction and the previous meeting minutes were reviewed and approved.
- 2. Fund Analysis (Matthew Tout):** Matthew provided an updated fund summary analysis. There were not many noticeable changes from the projections reviewed during the last committee meeting as the proposals came in exactly what was expected other than family services. All requests for recurring allocation increases were related to escalating personnel costs, which were anticipated. The projected ending reserve balance of \$203K for FY22-23 allows for some flexibility, especially if there are any changes in enrollment.

Q: Could you explain on why the reserve balance has increased?

A: The increase is the result of having slightly more fee revenue than we did in previous years. Also, having the fitness and recreation access fee of \$97K for Mission Bay coming off the ledger as well as the Bright Horizon contract running its course contributed to the net increase in ending reserves for last year and for the projection of next.

Q: Family Services has seen a significant increase since FY19-20, why is that?

A: The previous SSFAC approved a temporary request to fund a three-year pilot program to provide backup care through Bright Horizons.

Q: Why was the commitment to Family Services increased?

A: The committee asked Family Services asked for a review of what student parents needed. The survey resulted in an answer that overall, backup care for student parents was lacking and that is why this 3-year pilot program was initiated. Unfortunately, this launched during the pandemic which resulted in low utilization. With the fees no longer supporting the gym access fee it gave the previous committee more room for an increase to FS.

Q: What initially contributed to the reserve balance?

A: The result of an approach over the years to forecast the actual student fees before they arrive as this is primarily influenced by enrollment. We are always carrying forward the balance to allow for these unavoidable fluctuations.

Q: Does the actual fee revenue go up 3% every year?

A: No, it's less than 3% but this year it will be closer to that than in previous years.

3. Proposal Review

Wellness & Community (will not present at the next meeting)

The request is for \$70,188 in permanent funding. In-person events were interrupted due to COVID and were held virtually. The unit utilized professional producers for virtual events that could hold up to 200 attendees. These events averaged around 150 participants which included students and staff with 28 events held and 825 students attending in total.

Q: What is the reason for the increase from previous year?

A: Payroll, as is the circumstance with most of these units' requests. With the gym access fee allocation being taken away units were then allowed to ask for the payroll increase which historically used to occur. The only increase in funding to these units on a need basis was to student mental health services which was mandated by the UC system. All units are experiencing escalating costs to provide these services to students and the SSF doesn't go up every year which would be ideal to cover increased costs.

Q: It appears SSF supports 15% of their funding. Does that number reflect how many students use these services?

A: It's closer to 10% for this year, but in previous years it was more like 12%+, largely due to COVID with events being virtual.

Q: Is it fair to ask what the student usage is relative to the funding request?

A: Yes, this is a fair question but with the reality of COVID it might be prudent to give this some more time for things to get back to normal while not solely judging attendance of virtual events. It's also possible these units have increased services in the last 5 years without any increase to SSF.

Q: If the level of student engagement for this unit remains low is there any consideration to increase engagement?

A: This is something that should probably be asked of every unit and not just this particular one. The goal is always to maximize student engagement for every unit.

Family Services (will not present at next meeting)

The request is for \$1,636 in permanent funding and \$48,372 in temporary funding. Previous committee agreed to a backup care 3-year pilot program that began in 2020 which is currently free to use for students. Next year will be the last year of funding and next year's committee will be deciding upon its lifespan going forward. The number of registered students has doubled from 16 to 32 from the previous year.

Q: What determined the 10-day usage maximum?

A: This was based off what was given to faculty, residents, and fellows as the model.

Q: Is there a reason why the permanent amount is lower than what one would expect, specifically the \$1,636? Is this unit just underfunded?

A: This small portion goes to payroll for the person who is responsible for arranging care for these students. The temporary funding is part of the 3-year contract as this couldn't be a year-to-year deal in funding.

Fitness Recreation (will not present at next meeting)

The request is for \$228,997 permanent funding for outdoor programming. This unit as well as a few others serve multiple communities with SSF only comprising 4% of their budget.

Q: With SSF comprising so little of some these departments operating budget does it matter what we as students decide?

A: This really goes to the point is how can we serve students better. The feedback is the key here so things can get better. COVID has changed the landscape and it's important to consider how things will likely change in the near future.

GPSA (will not present at next meeting)

This request is for \$20,247 in permanent funding with no increase due to a lack of salary cost increases.

OCPD (will not present at next meeting)

The request is for \$514,105 in permanent funding.

SHCS (will present at next meeting)

The request is for \$2,010,839 in permanent funding. Currently, there are empty positions in need of fulfillment. Their action plan will be presented in the following SSFAC meeting.

Student Life (will not present at next meeting)

The request is for \$616,477 in permanent funding. Student utilization dropped slightly this past year due to the pandemic.

Next Steps

Student Health will be the only presenter at the next meeting. After that, students will vote upon each of the unit's requests. Questions, comments, and concerns will be included in the letter to the Chancellor.