University of California San Francisco
CHANCELLOR’S REGISTRATION FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
April 7, 2009

Members Present: John Fecondo (co-chair), Julie Hunkapiller, Kyriacos Koupparis, Taylor Landon, Elliot Gorelick, Lisa Watson, Son Huynh, Jenny Cohen, Nick Brandehoff, Alana Lerner

Faculty Present: Mark Rollins (co-chair)

Ex-Officio Members Present: Eric Koenig, Stella Hsu

Staff Present: Karen Hamblett, Michael Villanueva

Absent: Joe Castro,

Call to Order: Co-Chair John Fecondo called the meeting to order at 5:45 pm.

Key discussion points regarding changes the fund analysis:

Michael Villanueva (MV) reviewed the updates to the fund analysis since it was initially presented at the February 5th meeting. Changes include:
- Update the Winter quarter fee revenue with actual income
- Update the fringe benefit costs with actual dollars through February – this includes a cost increase of $33,000 effective January 1, 2009 – and projected costs March – June 2009
- Add the annualized UCRP cost for a full 12-month period on a permanent basis
- 4.2% fee increase will most likely be approved at the May Regents meeting
- Increase to the enrollment number from 2500 to 2550 (MV emphasized that it’s always unknown due to fee waivers)

Mark Rollins (MR) asked how the benefit cost increase would be covered – Reg Fee or General Fund? MV replied that since there was no additional money being allocated from the state or OP to fund additional costs. The rest of the campus was taking cuts to budgets and the Committee should not expect the general fund support to increase in 09-10 to cover the costs of the additional benefits or UCRP contributions. Campus budget cuts are estimated to be anywhere between 7% & 11% for 09-10 and more again in 10-11.

MR expressed a concern about breaking with historical practice and setting a new precedent for using registration fees to cover additional benefit costs previously covered by the General Fund, and that there may not be more general fund support forthcoming in the future. MR suggested the Committee could decide to cover the additional benefits and UCRP costs on a temporary basis to acknowledge the difficult financial challenges facing the campus and avoid committing to a permanent line item budget expense. The impact of using Registration Fees to fund benefit expenses would be respectfully communicated to the Chancellor along with a request to reconsider the shifting of these benefits expenses next year.

Eric Koenig (EK) stated that it had been his impression that the general fund covers benefit costs. When we ask units to make their requests, they request salary only, not benefits, because it has been the understanding that those are covered from general fund support, not directly from the student registration fees.

MR asked who made the decision to cover the increased and additional benefit costs from Registration Fee money?
MV explained that it was because there was no additional fund support and that other campus departments were not receiving additional support either and were taking cuts to their budgets.

EK pointed out that the registration fees are not sufficient enough to cover the cost of the services provided to students. That the Chancellor has, historically, been generous in contributing additional support to assist with costs in order to preserve and grow Reg Fee funded student services.

John Fecondo (JF) agreed and said that at other UC campuses students don’t have as much say in how the fees are spent and the process of distributing the funds is not as transparent.

Julie Hunkapiller (JH) in reference to the fact that we have general fund support for student services she pointed out that the other UC campuses had increased enrollment over time to increase their revenue to pay for student services. The services provided here at UCSF aren’t anything out of what should ordinarily be provided to UC students. As a campus, we just don’t generate enough revenue through registration fees to pay for it.
MR asked how long have we known that the registration fees would have to fund these additional costs? MV replied that on the initial fund analysis report there was no increased projection in the general fund support because the budget office didn’t anticipate any increase coming.

EK pointed out that for 09-10 that the registration fees were going to have to cover approximately $100,000 of additional costs that were not anticipated when you looked at the annualized UCRP and increased benefit costs.

Discussion about how to allocate funds included the following key points:

1. The Committee would like to start by setting aside 10% of the temporary budget as an operating reserve.
2. Units with no new requests wouldn’t require additional discussion this year and would continue to receive the same level of funding.
3. The permanent requests from Arts and Events, Child & Elder Car Services and Fitness and Recreation were initially moved to the temporary side of the working spreadsheet. The only change by the end of the meeting was to move the $2500 for scholarship money for Child & Elder Care back to the permanent side and recommend funding the request on a permanent basis since it was important for students to have an assured scholarship and not one that may end at the end of the year with temporary money.
4. Discussed that having Fitness and Recreation “buy back” 140 pedometers, as they suggested they could in their presentation, would save The Committee $3,038 (140 X $21.70 each). This was generally thought to be a good idea.
5. The carry-forward request of approximately $32,000 by Student Health Services (SHS) seemed reasonable since they were having difficulty finding a reliable data collection tool. They now have a model based on a WHO protocols so they can move forward.
6. The new request for a total of $12,335 from SHS was for the Heart Math program and wellness service provider retreat. The Committee had concerns about purchasing laptops ($6,165) until there were better utilization statistics to see how useful the program was to students. Debated whether to fund the training fees ($1,600) and/or back fill time for 2 providers ($1,200). The Committee wants to show support for the idea.
7. There was general consensus to fund 55% (rather than the current 50%) of the Director’s salary for the Student Learning Resources in recognition of the workload division between this area and the Director’s other area of responsibility, Student Disability Services. The additional salary cost for the 55% time Academic Support Services person ($8,400 sal. + $2,352 ben.) was recommended for approval.
8. After the last meeting of The Committee, Office of Career and Professional Development (OCPD) submitted a budget proposal addendum requesting temporary funding to continue support for the Administrative Assistant II for another year ($40,212 + benefits). This funding would be especially important to OCPD if funding for the new Analyst II position were not approved. If the Analyst II position were approved, then OCPD would only need temporary funding for the AA II position for 4-6 months during the transition.
9. There was general consensus to fully fund the salary for the Program Director – Health Sciences Professions, since Kathleen Cassidy was already in place and providing service to the students ($30,629 + approximately $9,064 in benefits).
10. The Committee is supportive and recognizes the need for the additional administrate person (Analyst II) in the Office of Career and Professional Development. They realize that this additional support is necessary to support and sustain the program growth that has already occurred and frees up the program directors to focus more on program development and time with students. There just doesn’t seem to be a way to fund it with the dollars available and the budget situation as it is right now. Discussion was beginning about how to maybe work a compromise, but The Committee ran out of time.
11. Most likely discussion will continue during the next meeting.

Next Meeting:

April 21, 2009 5:30-7:30 pm (S 30)
Discussion, voting and review of new process

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 PM.