University of California San Francisco  
CHANCELLOR’S STUDENT SERVICES FEE (SSF) ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Meeting Minutes  
February 27, 2012  

Members Present: Josh Biddle (co-chair), Dennis Ankrah, Christine Bui, Rebecca Kaplan, Lawrence Lin, Jason Tien, Brooke Gardner, Tom Dunehew, Doug Jacobs  

Faculty Present: Don Kishi (co-chair)  

Ex-Officio Members Present: Tracey Gearlds, Eric Koenig, Lisa Raskulinec  

Staff Present: Michael Villanueva, Karen Hamblett  

Absent: Kulginder Sran, Austin Nation, Diana Viscarra  

Josh and Don called the meeting to order at 5:45 pm then asked the Committee to reintroduce themselves.  

Bill Lindstaedt presented for Office of Career and Professional Development.  
New Request for 2012-13 - $28,000 for temporary 40% Career Counselor  
Discussion Summary:  
Doug Jacobs asked if the statistics showed number of appointments of number of students. Bill replied there were 1000 appointments and approximately 500 students served (average of 2 appointments per student).  

Brooke Gardner asked if students could go to faculty for their questions instead of OCPD. Bill responded that sometimes the faculty advisor isn’t always the best person to go to for career path guidance. Naledi Saul added that sometimes students want to explore a the idea of a career opportunity or have a question about including grades, in other words very specific issues they may not want to discuss with their faculty advisor. The idea is that OCPD compliments what the faculty advisor offers students.  

Josh Biddle asked if the SSF Committee temporarily funds a part-time career counselor what is OCPD’s long-term funding plan. In addition, who uses the services and who funds it (grad students, ASUCSF or GSA students). Bill replied that currently OCPD is pursing funding from the Office of Research and working with Development to seek funding for certain programs or targeted services.  

Regarding the question of who pays and uses, Eric Koenig noted that now funding for OCPD is fairly evenly split between campus support and SSF funding. Historically, OCPD was only SSF funded but recognized others on the campus were using the services so they requested funding from the campus to cover the costs so student fees wouldn’t be underwriting the cost exclusively.  

Jason Tien asked how many new students the new FTE can see. Naledi responded approximately 13 to 20 per week and Bill added the idea is to reduce wait time which is currently sometimes three weeks down to a one week wait and more flexibility to address “emergency” appointment requests. Jason asked if the 270 post docs were not given service would you be able to address the need without adding the requested career counselor. Naledi noted that the campus funds pay for the post docs and if OCPD weren’t serving them then that funding could be withdrawn. She added that she understands the issue of usage verses funding and will have better data with their new tracking software for next year. Bill said that Kathleen Cassidy and Naledi have a depth of knowledge they can transfer to post docs who can then help professional students. Brooke commented she felt it would be short sighted to not continue to offer the services to post docs as they provide a valuable resource to students.  

Don Kishi asked if there were underutilized services or programs that could be eliminated to reduce costs. Bill responded that they have made a couple programs that are more expensive to put on fee based or the schools share or cover the costs. Naledi added that OCPD has cut their programming budget by 15%. She noted the biggest part of the programming is food and speaker costs. OCPD has also moved some programming on-line and reduced their supply budget by 20%.  
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Peggy Ryan presented for Learning Resource Services.

Discussion Summary:

Eric introduced Peggy who just started in the role of Director in January. He noted that LRS has been around for about 2 ½ years and grew from the Mental Health Report with the idea to help students with academic stress before issues escalated to the point where a student felt they needed to go the Student Health and Counseling. He also mentioned that Disability Services has now split from LRS so they are two separate departments now.

Jason mentioned he hadn’t heard of LRS so he wondered how Peggy advertised the services. Peggy responded that word of mouth or faculty referrals were her biggest source of clients. She said LRS also presents at orientation and she is open to suggestions for more ideas to get the word out. Jason suggested broadcast emails once a quarter. Dennis Ankrah noted the e-mails might be best at the beginning of a quarter to remind students who may have had a tough previous quarter.

Lawrence Lin wondered if Peggy had an idea for why graduate student utilization was so low. Peggy replied that graduate students aren’t on campus as much and they work independently. Sometimes they come to her for help translating their classroom learning skills to independent planning. Brooke added that grad students are only in class the 1st year and even then it’s not grad focused, only pass/fail. Eric noted that Terry Smith had developed a workshop with GSA input and no one came the 1st time and one person came to the next. He acknowledged LRS still needed to find better ways to reach graduate students.

Don mentioned that the idea for an on-line learning style assessment Peggy mentioned in her presentation would be a wonderful thing to have before students even start school. Peggy said that would be a great idea and that maybe the information about it could be included in the packet of information sent to students once they are accepted.

Don noted it would be great if students didn’t feel using LRS held a stigma. Peggy reiterated that she works with high IQ students all the time who just need some help and agreed it would lovely to have the services be more a “normal” part of a student’s life.

Tom Dunehew asked if LRS had other staff and Peggy replied it was only her but that she received administrative support from the Office of Student Life.

Tim Neagle presented for Synapse.

Discussion Summary:

Tim began with the news that after 12 years overseeing the paper he is retiring at the end of June. Last year’s SSF Committee suggested Synapse conduct a readership survey so he reviewed the results.

Becky Kaplan asked what percentage of print copies ended up being recycled. Tim replied that he continued to reduce the number of print copies to reduce the amount left on the racks. Several years ago they printed ~4,000 now they print ~2,500. He noted that these days when people are waiting they look at their phones not print newspapers. He added that Synapse’s on-line advertising revenue was increasing while print advertising was decreasing.

Jason asked why there were benefits for the production assistant when they were only listed at 30% of and FTE. Eric replied that the 30% was a portion of a full time person who spent the rest of their time working on other things so they did receive benefits.

Brooke asked if the student editors needed prior experience and Tim replied no experience was need - he trained the on the job.

Don asked who reviewed the students’ articles and Tim responded that for the most part it was him but occasionally the paper’s review board. Don wondered if alumni help could help Tim with review so they could have more content.
Doug asked what the succession plan was with Tim’s imminent departure. Tim replied that his job would be posting in the next month.

Becky mentioned that the Thursday lunch meetings for the newspaper were tough for Mission Bay students to make and Tim acknowledged that was a difficult thing to coordinate. Eric noted that students from MB were sometime reluctant to take time from their lab work to write for the paper.

Brooke suggested that maybe the newspaper could be “distributed” on-line via e-mail or within the student guide. Tim said that was a good idea and that the new website was going to be more interactive as well. In addition, he noted that several writers from the newspaper “cut their teeth” at Synapse before going on to be technical health sciences writers.

Future meeting dates were confirmed.

Voting: None at this meeting

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 PM.