Student Fee Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
May 23, 2011


Guests: Mary Beth Harhen, Executive Director of Academic Senate; Susan Gillman, Chair of Academic Senate; Eric Peterson replacing John next year. John will become the Chair of the Staff Advisory Board.

Absent: Edward Garcia, Nicholas Cheatham, Free Moini

1. Approval of Agenda
   a. Agenda is approved.

2. Announcements
   a. Check In: Amanda asks everyone to introduce themselves and to share about what they are most looking forward to with the quarter ending.
   b. Amanda explains that she visited the C4 meeting last Friday and did outreach regarding SFAC positions.
   c. June 1st – SFAC Dinner with some business. Amanda will send out the Measure 7 recommendations for review prior to the meeting.
   d. Faye explains that she attended one of the budget forums that was sponsored last week by the EVC. She explains that there was a focused discussion on diversity. Alma attended the other forum and explains that there were a lot of questions about the tax extensions on the ballot, and discussion regarding the implications if the tax extensions do not get on the November ballot.

3. Academic Senate’s Proposal to Re-Align Retention Functions and Enrollment Management Functions
   a. Amanda welcomes the presenters, thanks them for coming, and asks them to speak to the following points: overview and background of the proposal; student input on the proposal; and how Academic Senate sees coordination with SFAC given purview for budget oversight of student services fee and referenda.
   b. Susan explains that the main idea behind the proposal is to bring a collaborative approach to student retention. The Academic Senate recognized that there is an opportunity to bring retention front and center for students. The Senate began with the premise regarding what are the services that serve students in their academic lives that are not as well coordinated, or effectively delivered as they should be.
   c. Susan explains that our retention is broken. The data that is gathered and analyzed by Planning & Budget shows that we have issues with retention, among high achieving students and students of color. We lose some students early on in their careers, and other students never graduate.
   d. Susan explains that the purview of the Senate is the academic mission of the university. Where is the campus failing our students? Where are we failing our campus? The
Academic Senate wants to answer these questions and to improve the academic life of students.

e. In terms of student input on this proposal:
   a. Susan explains that there are students who sit on the Committee on Planning and Budget where the proposal was vetted.
   b. Mary Beth adds that the administration asked the same question, how were administrators consulted? The idea was a strategic introduction of a proposal that would spark discussion around the issues.

f. Regarding coordination with SFAC, Susan asks for information regarding how the SFAC operates? What is relationship to funding streams? What is consultation process? Accounting and funding lines? Susan and Mary Beth are interested in knowing what SFAC’s concerns are. Susan acknowledges that overall, if the proposal is implemented, it may not look exactly as the proposal outlines.

g. Alma explains that the student services fee are here to support activity outside the classroom. In the last major budget cut in 2001, a significant amount of the student services fee was cut; at that time students passed Measure 7, which became the back-fill to the student services fee cuts.

h. Alma provides a summary of the EOP and LSS budgets.

i. Alma explains that the student services fee is governed by SFAC. SFAC participates in a systemwide committee, the Council of Student Fees. When there are new enrollment dollars in the student services fee and Measure 7, SFAC puts out a call and hears funding request presentations, and presentations related to how funds have been previously spent. The last two years, with very little new money coming in, the SFAC turned their attention to reviewing and auditing referenda, another student controlled funding stream. Alma also explains that the purpose of the SFAC is to assist the Chancellor, Campus Provost/EVC, and VCSA in regular efforts to ascertain the student body opinion on matters pertaining to student services fees, UCSC Student Programs Fee, Seismic and Life Safety Fee, and certain miscellaneous. She charge in SFAC orientation handbook: [http://www2.ucsc.edu/sfac/docs/10-11%20OrientationManual.pdf](http://www2.ucsc.edu/sfac/docs/10-11%20OrientationManual.pdf)

j. Alma explains that this year, SFAC spent time looking at the problems involving Measure 7, which has no cost of living adjustment. The group has been assessing how Measure 7 is being used by the units; how the leakage is impacting the units; and coming up with a recommendation for VC and EVC. Alma suggests that if the Academic Senate will be working with units funded by Measure 7 units, perhaps the Academic Senate could help find a solution for Measure 7 leakage. Susan responds that this is a possibility.

k. Amanda explains that in a typical year, SFAC would review allocations of new student services fee and student services fee adjustments.

l. Faye explains that if adopted, the proposal is meant to save money. Faye explains that VPDUE would coordinate with SFAC and with Academic Senate, more coordination and more alignment with Academic Senate purview will save money. Faye asks: “won’t there be an extra expense in the VPDUE’s office regarding coordination with SFAC?” Mary Beth explains that those types of concerns are not necessarily in the Senate’s purview. The report looks at taking the mission of these units and leveraging into the Academic Senate. Susan explains that consultation with SFAC would proceed as it does now; the difference is that the director of enrollment services would work directly
with the Academic Senate. Susan provides an example that would bring about positive change.

a. Mary Beth explains that faculty have expressed concern that they do not know if LSS is meeting the needs of students. She explains that faculty say that they send people down there (to LSS) and hope they get what they need. Mary Beth explains that currently, there is very little interaction between faculty and LSS, structurally. Leveraging the relationship will enhance services.

m. Callin provides a student perspective. He explains that this proposal does not bring any substantive change. I don’t see how moving these services under Academic Senate is going to improve anything. Students are feeling like this is a strategy to dismantle these services. Students have issues with academic senate and they seek out resources such as EOP for support. Callin explains that we need improvement with major pathways, improved advising, ethnic studies. Susan responds that the Academic Senate fully agrees.

n. Susan explains that the definition of accountability definition is quality of service. Susan explains that the whole point of the university is to support students academically. Susan explains that the SFAC audit is very helpful. We are most interested in admissions, enrollment management and moving students through majors, which includes services in Student Affairs that are providing critical services to students. Individual unit missions should be aligned with campus mission. An issue with small units, is that they have an individual scope and mission. We want to make sure all student services are aligned with campus priorities, so we don’t fail individual students, or groups of students.

o. Faye explains that she is here in SFAC as the Provost representative; Council of Provosts feels very strongly about the proposal, especially because of advising. Faye explains that Cowell and Stevenson are two of the least diverse colleges. EOP advises students in such a way that creates a lot of work for the college advisers, especially in the first two years. EOP and Advising in Colleges are giving two different messages. Faye references a document, the Retention report which was published by VC McGinty and VPDUE Mark Cioc; there is a lack of coordination when it comes to advising.

p. Alma explains that she is the person who oversees Retention Services; she explains that in the past, the units were not data driven or outcomes oriented. EOP does resource advising, as in her office, EOP is working with students who are having academic issues, such as special populations like AB540. She explains that she can see how advising may be contradictory when advising in EOP is looking at the “whole life” of the student. Alma explains that it’s important for these individual student cases to come forward, and for students to appeal decisions, so that academic colleagues can see the full scope of the challenges that students are facing, especially if the campus is interested in becoming a Hispanic Serving Institution. Faye explains that we care about students not because we are a social services agency, but because we have an academic mission.

q. Alma summarizes SFAC concerns:
   a. Group wanted to ask how they can continue to work with Academic Senate regarding concerns on funding streams
b. Educate Academic Senate that referenda are binding agreements between students and the University; for instance, changes in referenda language would require going out to vote again.
c. If there are going to be changes, that should be vetted with SFAC and possibly SUA and GSA.
r. Warren suggests a system to improve communication between College advisers and EOP advisers, utilizing the AIS system.
s. Callin explains that he understands what is being said, he reiterates that the question is how will VPDUE make a significant change in retention with a new reporting line? Callin asks whether the VPDUE will be accountable to SFAC? Callin suggests speaking with LSS and EOP; Mary Beth responds that Academic Senate committees closer to these units, are having conversations with them. Callin suggests speaking to students in these committees.
t. Amanda asks for a timeline. Mary Beth responds that this is an EVC decision. The proposal was meant to create a spark and to begin discussions, but the Academic Senate realizes that July 1st, the requested implementation date, is probably unrealistic.
u. Susan and Mary Beth ask that any other questions be directed to them directly. Amanda will collect all questions and concerns and forward. Amanda asks that SFAC be added to any distribution lists on information, updates, reports, etc. related to the proposal.
v. Alma suggests providing a copy of the SFAC orientation manual to the Academic Senate:
w. Alma expresses her concern to Susan and Mary Beth that EOP has been serving as a resource center for a portion of AB 540 students, and to take this into consideration with their planning. It would be a shame to lose this effort in any potential transition process.

4. Debrief of Academic Senate Proposal
   a. Amanda suggests that SFAC members email their questions to her tonight, and she will forward to the guests.
   b. Lucy expresses concern that the proposal lacks any kind of goals and objectives related to measurable retention outcomes.
   c. John asks whether the Academic Senate considered the impact of fee increases on retention? Is this being considered as a major factor?
   d. Warren asks whether there will be a fee increase mid year next year? This impacts retention as students come to UCSC, and are not prepared to absorb?
   e. Warren asks about academic units being issued to students in lieu of pay, if LSS is under VPDUE? Is this a possibility?

5. Election of Chair and Vice Chair
   a. Amanda explains the process to elect the Chair and Vice Chair for 2011-2012; all voting takes place via secret ballot. Per the bylaws, member must be present to vote.
   b. Nomination for Chair
      a. Chelsea nominates Callin for Chair; Warren seconds the nomination. Callin accepts the nomination.
c. Nomination for Vice Chair
   a. Callin nominates Chelsea for Vice Chair; Chelsea accepts the nomination
   b. Robert nominates Warren for Vice Chair; Warren accepts the nomination

d. Callin is asked to share his ideas for next year
   a. Callin has sat on SFAC for two years, and has seen the group go from non-productive to productive. There are so many budget discussions going on campus and SFAC needs to be involved. There is too much politicking on this campus and student voice is often lost in that process; SFAC needs to be that voice. Callin mentions that he’s interested in focusing on adding the CPI to Measure 7, however, students are concerned about how much of Measure 7 is going to staffing. Callin believes that more of Measure 7 needs to go to direct student services. In terms of how things will operate next year, let’s not wait until the end of quarter to come up with recommendations and reports. I want to make SFAC’s presence more known.

b. Chair – Voting
   1. 9 members voted in the election
   2. Callin Curry is elected to Chair of SFAC for the 2011-2012 academic year

c. Vice Chair
   1. Chelsea explains that she is the current Chair of the Cowell Senate. She has completed her first year of SFAC and is interested in continuing in service. Chelsea will be a fourth year next year.
   2. Warren explains that he is qualified for this position because he is in two fraternities; participation in a social fraternity has developed interpersonal skills. He knows about current issues, especially related to first year students. Member of professional business fraternity with initiatives that are business oriented. Warren explains that he doesn’t focus on profit, puts person before profit. I want to do something for the campus. I served SFAC in 2007, after this year, I understand the committee a lot more. I love Santa Cruz and want to help students out. Most students don’t know who we are and what we do. I want to increase school pride. We are missing this in Santa Cruz, and it impacts retention. More funding for tutoring, sections and student jobs. We need more help for students.
   3. Voting
      a. 9 members voted in the election
      b. Chelsea Manlapig is elected as the Vice Chair of SFAC for the 2011-2012 academic year.

6. Next Meeting
   a. SFAC will have it’s final meeting next Wednesday, June 1st at 6:00 pm. Lucy will send out information about the dinner meeting. At the meeting, we will review the final Measure 7 recommendations, and the by-laws.