University of California San Francisco
CHANCELLOR’S STUDENT SERVICES FEE (SSF) ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Planning Meeting Minutes
April 24, 2013

Members Present:
  GSA- Jason Tien (co-chair), Rebekah McLaughlin, Melissa Hendershott, Thomas Young, and Schola Matovu
  ASUCSF- Josh Biddle, Thomas Dunehew, Doug Jacobs, Iveta Markova, Michael Yang, and Renu Gaur

Faculty Present: Don Kishi (co-chair)

Ex-Officio Members Present: Eric Koenig, Angela Hawkins

Staff Present: Michael Villanueva, Yen Lara, Chau Tu, Matthew Tout

Absent: Lisa Raskulinec, Lawrence Lin

Call to Order (time): Jason called meeting to order at 6:13pm

Welcome:

Fund analysis:

Chau Tu presented the fund analysis that includes estimated costs for 2012-13 through 2014-15. Two budget scenarios were distributed to the committee. 2012-13 revenue is estimated at $2.61 million, slightly higher than previously projected as actual enrollment increased more than the projected 25 students. The return-to-aid share is $75,000 and the fund support from the Chancellor is $645,956. Net Revenue for 2012-13 is estimated to be $3.19 million; 2013-14 at $3.23 million and 2014-15 at $3.28 million.

The first scenario presented assumes no changes to the budget allocations, except for fixed cost increases. This scenario shows the reserve reduced down to $299K from $520K in 2012-13 and further to $136K in 2013-14 and carrying a deficit of $137K in 2014-15.

The second scenario presented assumes no changes to the budget allocations, except for fixed cost increases and a budget reduction of $129K to Student Health and Counseling Services. This scenario shows the reserve reduced down to $299K from $520K in 2012-13 and further to $265K in 2013-14 and $121K in 2014-15.

Chau navigated through the Budget Recommendation table projected on the screen, highlighting each unit’s request. She demonstrated and explained how permanent and/or temporary budget augmentation(s) would affect the projected fund balance for 2013-14 and 2014-15.

Committee discussions on recommendations:

Josh stated that if all proposals are approved, SSF will be solvent for at least next 3 years through 2014-15. If SSFAC goes this route, this will allow SSFAC to establish structural changes and principles to resolve budget issues on a longer term basis. However, the reserves will be reduced substantially. Don pointed out that over the years that he’s been on the UCSF campus, he’s observed that budget issues and circumstances will fluctuate and change so he advised against the committee feeling like they have to make drastic cuts.

Art & Events- Proposal is for 0.6 FTE totaling $66,001 for salary and benefits which is the same as last year. Two members objected to approving this proposal.
There was a referendum proposed to increase ASUCSF fee from $17 to $28 per quarter which was not approved by students. Out of 325 students who voted for the referendum, 57% voted against and 43% for approving where there was a difference of 7 votes against the referendum. As a result, the funding for RCO (Registered Clubs and Organizations) activities will be reduced by 25%.

SSFAC will revisit ASUCSF’s request of $8000 in temporary funds. This is somewhat related to whether Family Services’ proposal is approved.

Office of Career & Professional Development (OCPD)-
OCPD is requesting $28,800 for 0.4 FTE in temporary funds - $17,626 salary plus benefits. The SSFAC suggested recommending that temporary funds for FTE proposals can only be requested for 2 years before the unit is required to request recurring funds. No member objected to approving this proposal.

Family Services-
Jason shared that the Graduate Dean, along with the UC, is considering a proposal to provide graduate students with families up to $4,000 per year to assist with offsetting family costs. The hope is to establish a model for other schools to also adopt. The SSFAC is concerned about the cost-to-benefit ratio of the Sittercity Selectplus program where there is no data yet on how many students have families and who will actually use the program.

SSFAC will revisit Family Services’ proposal which is somewhat related to whether the ASUCSF proposal is approved. If Family Services’ proposal is not approved, it should be stated clearly in the letter to the Chancellor that Family Services have made great efforts in coming up with a plan to utilize SSF funds to increase the cost-to-benefit value to students (e.g. SitterCity Selectplus program).

Council on Student Fees-
The proposal is move the $2000 line item to be recorded as miscellaneous costs. Chau indicated that the Budget Office will continue to track the expenditures in a separate DPA from the miscellaneous costs DPA, however a budget proposal going forward will not be required. No members objected to approving this proposal.

Fitness & Recreation-
Angela clarified that the proposal regarding the Wellness Program is to provide students with the same Living Well services that are already provided to staff. Two members objected to approving this proposal since there is a belief that there is some duplicate service in the Wellness hikes. Angela clarified that Living Well program does open the door to more services other than the Wellness hikes. Eric pointed out that the amount of the proposal was more “symbolic” where the services are already available and Fitness & Recreation does not want to turn away students if they want to participate in these programs.

SSFAC will revisit Fitness & Recreation’s proposal.

Graduate Student Association-
No members objected to approving the proposal for $8231.

Student Activity Center-
There was a discussion regarding the number of FTE support possibly decreasing; this is ongoing discussion. There could be some salary savings due to the director retiring this year. No members objected to approving this proposal.

Student Health & Counseling-
There was more discussion regarding the overlapping services of the nutritionist in Fitness & Recreation and the dietician in Student Health & Counseling. Angela clarified that the dietician is a clinician that also provides nutritionist services. Both the nutritionist and the dietician is part-time where the nutritionist is funded by Fitness & Recreation and the dietician is funded by the SSF fund. No objections to approving proposal however, Angela will follow up on whether both positions can be combined to one position and funded by Fitness & Recreation.
**Learning Resource Services (LRS)**  
There was some discussion regarding the policy letter stating that this is an academic mission of the university so should this be funded by the schools instead (i.e. from core funds instead of SSF funds). Michael V clarified that the letter does state that this program can be funded by SSF. No members objected to approving the proposal, however, LRS needs to explore funding from schools, particularly since the program will be growing. Eric recommended that SSFAC members, as advisors to the Chancellor and therefore, in a strong position to do so, send this message to the Chancellor rather than putting pressure on LRS to seek funding from schools.

**Synapse Publication**  
The SSFAC brought up concerns on utilization, the lack of data as to how Synapse benefits students, and growing outreach and availability to students, particularly since there were a lot of changes that occurred this year. The consensus though is that Synapse can be a valuable resource to students who write (medical journals, etc). The SSFAC recommendation is to showcase their value to students now that a lot of positive changes have occurred. No members objected to approving the proposal.

**LGBT Resource Center**  
The proposal is for $10,000 for 2 major LGBT events whereas in prior years, there was also a request for funding a portion of the LGBT director. Eric clarified that the events are not RCO’s and was considered a part of the program services. The requested funding serves the student population even though this is not a student service, per se. SSFAC recommends that Diversity also provide funding and that the schools for the students who receive credit for the events provide funding. Jason also brought up concerns that there is no leadership currently due to the vacant director position though Eric clarified that this will be filled soon in June.

**Student Services at Mission Bay**  
No members objected to approving this proposal.

**Voting**  
No formal voting done at this meeting.

**Next meeting:**  
SSFAC will revisit ASUCSF (if possible), Family Services, and Fitness & Recreation proposals.

**Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned at 8:05m.