

## Winter 2015 Council on Student Fees Meeting Report

The 2015 winter quarter Council on Student Fees (CSF) meeting was held February 21-22 at UC Los Angeles, with Paul Tchir (SFAC Chair), Jackie Markt-Maloney (SFAC Vice Chair) and Ellen Kim (Marshall College Representative) in attendance as representatives from UC San Diego. Aside from UCSF, UCB, and UCD (the latter of whom withdrew from CSF some time ago), all campuses were present. The first major item of business was an update on the University of California's tuition plan for the following year. President Napolitano announced that the new fee system would not take effect until summer 2015, and that the May revise of the budget would determine tuition for fall 2015. Currently, the three options are to keep the same tuition frozen for the next three year, increase tuition at a lower rater than the proposed 5% increase, or raise tuition by 5%. If tuition is increased, student services fees would increase by \$24 that would be dedicated towards mental health. Speaker Toni Atkins is also looking to pull apart the opaqueness of UC spending and hopes her assembly bill will bring the UC system more in line with the California State University (CSU) and California Community College (CCC) systems.

The next major item on the agenda concerned how much money each UC campus governed and how much was dedicated towards permanent funding. UCLA stated that they governed approximately \$37-38 million dollars, but had been encountering problems as more funds being requested as temporary are, in reality, being utilized as if they were permanent funds through annual re-requests. UC Santa Barbara allocates approximately \$280,000, but will not allocate or fund permanent projects. UC Irvine allocates approximately \$250,000 and has \$41,000 dedicated to one-time funding, while the remaining funds are for permanent funding. Some of the campuses were unclear exactly how much they allocated each year, as allocation

amounts varied year to year, while UCSD lacks an allocation system and thus could not answer the question. The clear concern and trend across UC campuses was that the demands and services needed by the student population have increased, but the total money available has been staying the same. This has caused many SFACs to have less flexibility in their decision making due to the requirements mandated by each campus's SFAC charter.

The committee then broke out into different CSF campaign workgroups and planned best strategies for progress. The funding stream campaign seeks to understand the UCOP tax for each campus and determine who pays for the student services fee tax, specifically for each of the three tiers for the entire campus, faculty and staff, and students enrolled on the campus. Ultimately, the campaign seeks to determine and prevent any student services programs or fees paying the 1.6% UCOP tax. The referendum campaign finished the language for a new CSF Standing Policy and was completed on Saturday. The new Standing Policy passed by CSF now awaits final approval by each UC campus. Finally, the data acquisition campaign is working towards evaluating SFAC processes for the collection of student fees and best practices for getting feedback. The committee discussed models for campuses that do not have the capabilities to send out all-campus data, which at the moment is only UCSD.

The second day began with a discussion of the effect that tuition increases will have on student services fees, as well as a discussion of California State Constitutional Amendment (SCA) 1. If tuition increases, there will be a 5% (\$48) increase in student services fees, half of which will be devoted to student mental health. The objective of SCA 1 is to enact a form of legislative control over the UC system and the Regents by giving the legislature the power to veto tuition and executive payroll increases and implement minimum wage standards. The biggest question raised was how the legislature and governor will maintain student and academic

autonomy. It would trigger more transparency, as the Regents would have to open their books and justify payroll increases and unbalanced accounts. Currently, the legislature can only suggest student involvement, but if SCA 1 passes, it can mandate it. The largest pushback from SCA 1 would be that it politicizes the UC system. As it stands the Regents, including the student Regents, are against SCA 1 since it would strip their autonomy. The University of California Student Association (UCSA), meanwhile, has passed a resolution in support of SCA 1.

The 2015 spring quarter CSF meeting will take place at UC Merced, who will be hosting the next meeting on April 11-12. Among the most important items of business at this meeting will be the selection of the new CSF chair, as well as the locations of the 2015-2016 meetings.