Given the budgetary constraints of this fiscal year, the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) shifted its priorities, with direction from Vice Chancellor Felicia McGinty, to focus on the following: research the feasibility of a central, campus funding body; review campus-based fees; and, meet with campus units for budgetary updates. In order to make the work more manageable and accomplish these tasks, the committee broke into subcommittees focusing on the central campus funding body and reviewing campus-based fees while the entire committee met with the managers during regularly scheduled SFAC meetings during Fall and Winter Quarters. This report outlines our findings and recommendations for the campus fees and central funding body research, for next year.

**Part 1: Campus Fees Subcommittee**

Before summarizing our findings, we want to discuss how we came to our conclusions. We assigned an equal number of fees to everyone on the subcommittee. Everyone was asked to obtain an itemized budget of the fee, along with the measure language (or fee language if applicable), and provide a short conclusion on the expenditure of the fee with respect to the measure language.

Our findings for the campus-based fees are straightforward. Many of the fees follow the language that was used to set them. However, some fees were noted for further questions, for example, the Class Schedule fee and the Student Voice Empowerment fee. Some fees were brought to question due to their unusual, vague, and/or high expenditures. A few follow-up questions were also brought up by the structures of some fees, like the Sports Team Fee (for example, how are allocations made, and who makes the decisions). A summarized list of conclusions can be seen on page 4. Only half of the fees were researched during 2008-2009; subsequent review of the remaining fees will take place in 2009-10.

Throughout the process of assessing the Campus Fees, we came across some challenges. As we were doing conclusions/follow ups, one of the common problems was the vagueness in budgets. When the budgets were submitted to the committee, and due to the lack of descriptions of account names, most assumptions of what an account was for were made on interpretations of account names. This led to the possibility that some of our assumptions on the accounts may have been wrong. Another problem that arose was the difficulty of obtaining budgets from units that manage the fees on a day-by-day basis. Some units were confused when asked to provide an itemized budget of the fee, thus adding to the requisition time. Lastly, when we did have the budget for a fee, and the correct assumptions were made, the committee had a difficult time determining if anything was noteworthy.

These issues can be solved by a few measures, which are suggestions the committee would like to make to next year's committee. One suggestion is to have the units managing the fees be informed at the beginning of the fiscal year to expect a call from the SFAC, requesting the fee’s budget, similar to the call letter for funding requests traditionally sent out regarding use of the Registration / Measure 7 Fees. This call letter would outline the reasons why we are conducting the review, and what the committee is looking for in the budget (for example, a budget template). This would prepare the units to expect a request from an SFAC member, thus preventing any confusion/reluctance. It would also provide a common structure to the requested budgets, preventing any confusion on both sides. Second, the requests should also make note that the unit should provide definitions/descriptions of the accounts and what the money funds. This would prevent any false assumptions being made regarding what fee monies are funding. Third, committee members and staff should increase follow up with fee managers throughout the process to insure budgets are received. The last recommendation is, when making the
request for budgets, to include the budgets from both prior and current years. This would allow the

group to make comparisons on expenditures of the fees.

In conclusion, our findings suggested a few questions on how fee money is being spent, but
other than that, were very straightforward. This was the first year the SFAC reviewed campus fees,
thus we ran into some challenges, but nothing that crippled the process. As chair, I hope that these
recommendations are considered the next time the committee is called to review the campus fees.

**Part 2: Central Funding Body**

The second task charged to us by Vice Chancellor Felicia McGinty was to research the
feasibility of a central funding pool for student organizations and events. The subcommittee assigned
to this task focused on looking at different schools to see the different models of funding student
organizations and events, and see what UCSC would need to do in order to have a more centralized
model of funding.

For UCSC, the current system has students writing proposals for a dozen or so different
departments and funding sources to secure the necessary funding for their event. This may not be in
the best interest of the students. A central funding pool would enable students to follow a particular
procedure and obtain a designated amount of funds. Individual departments or units could still co-
sponsor events, but rather than providing financial support it would be simply a gesture of support and
solidarity. The groups and students lose time for programming and cannot focus on the core priorities
of the student organization/group with the current system as it is.

The subcommittee first looked at universities within the state, most notably the other UC
campuses. Then the subcommittee looked at universities and colleges outside of the state, mostly east-
coast schools. The models that were found at different schools had basic core concepts, with variations
in the distribution; where a pot of money is generated through a student programs fee and is allocated
by a board (either part of or separated from the student government).

For example, one of the funding bodies at UC Davis is a council, UC Davis Club Finance
Council, and gives grants to student organizations, dance grants, and long and short-term loans.
Applicants have to apply for funds and attend a workshop in order to qualify for funds. There are 13
students on this council to review applications. On the east coast, some universities follow the model
of having a separate fee with a council/committee focused on funding student events. There are
instances on different campuses that use a portion of the fee to fund performers, artists and entertainers
brought onto the campus. And sometimes there were campuses that had a separate fund for cultural
programming, similar to UCSC's own CEP.

Out of the subcommittee’s observations, a recommendation for three possible funding bodies
was brought to the group:

1. Programming Board pot with funds to bring in high profile artists/speakers – this would absolve
small student organizations from this responsibility.

2. Central Funding pot with funds allocated to student organizations for programs and services
they offer to their members and/or the population at large.

3. Cultural Programming pot, like the existing CEP process, that funds programming that
contributes to the cultural life of the campus and promotes diversity and appreciation of
difference.

To continue the feasibility study of a centralized funding body, the SFAC will have to research
the current funding groups on the UCSC campus, plus continue looking at different models seen at
other universities and colleges. With this research, and the findings of different models, the SFAC can
continue making recommendations on this task. When the committee moves forward with the
feasibility study, the group should look into the current “centralized” funding bodies (i.e. Core Council,
CEP, etc.) and make recommendations for creating a true centralized funding body at UCSC.

Part 3: Unit Manager meetings
The third task charged to the committee was to meet with the different unit managers currently
funded by the Registration / Measure 7 Fees, to get updates and become informed on what the different
units were doing during the fiscally tight year. The committee drafted ten questions for each unit
manager to answer, and met separately with them in order to discuss any additional questions outside
of the reports they submitted.

The questions we asked were the following:

1. Please provide us with a copy of your budget for 2008-2009, and an organization chart for
   your unit. Please highlight your Registration/Measure 7 Fee budget(s).

2. Does your unit have carryforward funds this year? If so, how do you plan to use those
   funds?

3. Does your unit receive referendum funding, and if so how are you spending those funds?

4. How much of your budget goes towards student initiated programming? Is that amount
   static? What would be an average over the past few years?

5. Beyond student initiated funding, what are your spending plans for this year?

6. How is your unit dealing with the 7% Registration Fee funding cut?

7. How do you make funding allocations?

8. Is there student input in your funding allocation decisions? If so, what’s the process?

9. Do you do qualitative and/or quantitative assessment of your services? If so, please provide
   samples to the committee. How did you incorporate the feedback in your operations?

10. What are your top priorities?

With each of the units, they provided their answers to each of the questions during the meetings we had
with them. There were a few common themes with question number 6, how did units deal with the 7%
Registration Fee funding cut? This question was proposed before the knowledge of the additional 10%
mid-year cut. The few units that had vacant positions available to them reduced those first, and some
others cut the supply and expenses fund. However, many units had to eliminate filled positions or
cut/shorten programming core to the unit (e.g. EOP cut their Bridge Program by 3 days; SASS made cuts to MSI and ARC operating budget).

**Conclusions**

As seen, the campus fees and central funding body research were not simple projects. The SFAC made these recommendations to the 2009-2010 SFAC in order to continue and smooth the process during 2009-2010.

Matthew Payne
Chair, Student Fee Advisory Committee

**Conclusions on Campus Fees**

**2008-2009 Summary:**

**Fees requiring follow-up:**

- Intramural and Sports Team Fee
- Class Schedule Fee
- Intercollegiate Sports Team Fee
- Physical Education Program Fee
- Graduate Student Facilities Fee
- College Student Government Fee (GSA)
- Student Voice and Empowerment Fee.

**Fees with no follow-up needed at this time:**

- Learning Support Services Fee
- Seismic Life Safety Fee
- Transportation Fee
- Campus-wide Student Government Fee
- Child Care Fee
- OPERS Fitness Facilities Fee
- Recreation Programs Fee

**Fees that were not reviewed in 2008-2009:**

- Campus Programs Fee
- College Student Government Fee – (UG)
- Student Programs Fee
- Campus Sustainability Fee
- Engaging Education Program Fee
- Community and Resource Empowerment Fee
- Student Media Council Fee
- Theater Arts Fee
- Student Facilities Fee
- Student Life Facilities Fee
- Free/Anonymous HIV Testing Fee
- Seymour Marine Discovery Center Fee
- Renewable Energy Fee
- Sustaining the Student Media Voice Fee
- Support GIIP Fee.

For a more detailed summary of the fees that were reviewed, please see pages 5-7.
Seismic Life Safety Fee
Current fee: $40/qtr, beginning Fall, 2007, sunsets 2038
Previous fee: $25/qtr, 2004-2007

The fee, which was imposed by the chancellor, is currently funding retrofit of the Health Center and West Field House, and covers student funded buildings only. In the past, part of Hahn, Student Union, Cantu Center, and Women’s Center were retrofitted with these funds. The fee will stop in 2038.

No Follow up is needed. The committee cannot recommend changes to this fee.

Intramural and Sports Team Fee
Current fee: $2.25/qtr, beginning Fall, 2006

The fee is meant to support team activities including team allocations, travel, equipment purchase and officials. For the most part, the use of the funds follows the ballot language that was used to establish the fee. One supplies cost of $16,845 seems fairly high, and the SFAC should follow up with the OPERS business manager about that item, as well as the $245 CAMFAC repairs of $128 and $254.

Transportation Fee
Current fee: $111.66/qtr, beginning Fall, 2008
Previous fees: many; first $3.50/qtr beginning Fall, 1969

The fee is meant to support Campus Transit Operations, the shuttle service, and funding unlimited student ridership of the SCMTD buses.

No follow up is needed. The Fee is following the spirit of the measure language.

Campus-wide Student Government Fee
Current fee: $7/qtr, beginning Fall, 2003
Previous fees: $1.30/qtr Fall, 1983, $2/qtr, Fall, 1993

The fee is meant to support administrative and office expenses for the SUA and UCSA membership, and outreach to the undergraduate student body. The 2008-2009 budget provided by SUA shows a carry forward of $188,871 from last year, for a total budget of $555,736 for the year. The expected all year expense is $555,736.

SUA did not give a detailed breakdown of the specific fee usage.

Child Care Fee
Current fee: $8/qtr, beginning Fall, 1997
Previous fees: $1/qtr, Fall, 1985, $3/qtr, Fall, 1991

The fee is meant to support campus childcare programs serving students with children, including supplies and expenses. According to members of the committee, the important parts to take away from the ballot measure discussion on the use of the fee are the following: “correct operating deficits” and “support efforts to expand child care facilities, services and funding base”. The “correct operating deficits” language essentially allows EES to use the fee money for anything needed to run and maintain the unit. It allows the unit to use the fee money to cover items, services, and the like needed for the unit's operation that might otherwise put said unit into a deficit.

Thus, the unit seems to be using the fee money appropriately, following the intent of the ballot measure that enacted it and no follow up is needed.
Class Schedule Fee
Current fee: $1.10/year

The fee is meant to support the cost of printing the paper class schedules. The Registrar's Office is indeed using the money for that purpose. While the itemized budget does indicate how many class schedules were printed, (and thus purchased), by the Registrar's Office for the last six quarters, it fails to specify how many of these schedules were picked up by students. In other words, how many students are actually using these schedules and, is there a “need” for them still? Since enrollment takes place online and a searchable schedule is available, and a part of, the online enrollment in a student's my.ucsc portal, usage of class schedules may not be that high. Furthermore, even if they are used, does usage necessarily constitute “need”? These are questions and areas that the committee may want to explore in light of the current budget situation.

Intercollegiate Sports Team Fee
Current fee: $5/qtr, beginning Fall 2007

The fee is meant to expand the athletic department training room hours, support athletic team allocations, travel, equipment, game management, student workers, membership fees, salaries for administrative staff and coaches. All of the expenses relate to sports teams at UCSC. From insurance and coaches to the actual teams themselves, all of the various allocations are in line with the language of the fee referendum. Members of SFAC did have some questions as to how the funds are allocated to specific teams, and who decides?

Physical Education Program Fee
Current fee: $4.50/qtr, beginning Fall, 2007

The fee is meant to fund additional Physical Education classes, replace worn equipment, to increase salaries for the PE instructors, and to provide outreach to the colleges to encourage more participation in the PE programs and to offer a limited number of classes in various locations around campus, thus making classes more convenient to attend.

The SFAC conclusion is that the funds are spent according to the ballot language, as it was spent on instructors and supplies. The committee recommends to follow up on 1) What extra courses are now offered as a result of the fee? 2) At what new locations do they now offer fitness classes, and 3) What outreach efforts at other locations have been funded by the fee?

OPERS Fitness Facilities Fee
Current fee: $15/qtr

The funding pays for the East Field House bond. After the loan is paid off, a student majority board will recommend how the fee should be adjusted for inflation. Members of SFAC recommend the SFAC should be part of the discussion at that time.

Graduate Student Facilities Fee
Current fee: $32/qtr

The fee is used to build, operate and maintain the Graduate Commons, and lasts 27 years (passed in 1997). The SFAC has two questions for follow-up: 1) How will the facility be maintained and operated when the fee runs out? and 2) What percentage of the fee is allocated to the Graduate Commons Board and what percentage of the fee is used to pay for Graduate Commons staff?
Recreation Programs Fee
Current fee: $4/qtr

The fee provides funding for a variety of UCSC Recreation Programs, including trips, clubs, vehicles, the Fall Festival, holistic health and leadership. The fee was intended to enhance the quality of services provided by OPERS, with no clear exceptions, and it was approved without any oversight clause.

Thus, no follow up is needed.

College Student Government Fee – Graduate Students
Current fee: $14.50/qtr
Previous fee: $10/qtr

The fee provides the Graduate Student Association (GSA) with funding for research travel grants, statewide lobbying efforts, and networking activities annually sponsored by the GSA. Members of SFAC would like to see an accountability report, indicating how GSA has utilized the fee to maintain services to graduate students as the student population grows.

Student Voice and Empowerment Fee
Current fee: $.75/qtr

This fee provided funding to the SUA Student Committee on Committees (SCOC) to ensure student representation and voice on all major campus decision-making and advisory committees, and facilitate campus wide outreach for available positions.

SFAC members feel this is a well intended but ineffective fee measure. Providing stipends to students who participate on committees is a good way to enable the participation of interested students, but not a good incentive for students to participate. The budget breakdown indicates that a considerable amount of the fee is unused each year. It’s unclear if this is because SCOC is ineffective or if there just is not sufficient interest in committee work. One SFAC representative’s comments: “In either case, an intervention is needed to release the funds that were not used for their intended purpose (e.g., if 55% was supposed to go to committee member stipends but only 10% was used, the remaining 45% can’t be used for something else without some sort of official intervention, right?).”

Learning Support Services Fee
Current fee: $6.64/qtr

The fee is used to support the Modified Supplemental Instruction portion of Learning Support Services. The fee is used to support 274 MSI student positions averaging approximately eight to ten hours per week. The total cost of the program during the 2007-2008 academic year was $155,125.91, which was used to set the cost of Measure 30. The cost from Fall 2008 to now has increased 17%. There is no need for follow up.