UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
UC RIVERSIDE

Student Service Fee Advisory Committee
Friday, April 25, 2014; 3:00 to 5:00 PM
HUB Room 269

Name	Association	Voting Privilege[1]	Attendance
Cardenas. Lazaro	ASUCR	X	P
Cassell, Jon [Alternate]	ASUCR	X	P
Dow, Liam	ASUCR	X	P
Hong, Ashley	ASUCR	X	A
Eckman, Cathy	Interim CFAO, Ex-Officio, VCSA	-	P
Flores, Stephanie	Ex-Officio-RP&B	-	A
Salazar, Susana	Ex-Officio-RP&B	-	P
Taliaferro, Alexander	ASUCR	X	P
Tang, Janice	ASUCR	X	A
Ta, Johnny	ASUCR	X	P
Fahmian, Sean	ASUCR	X	A
Polishko, Anton	GSA	X	P
Stewart, Terrance	GSA	X	P
Lucas, Keira	GSA	X	P
Alvarez, Luis	Staff	X	P
Sedita, Jolene	Staff	X	P
Sanchez Martinez, Veronica	Secretary	-	X
Lillie, Sue	Staff Support	-	X
Guests			

P – Present   A – Absent   L – Late   Exc. – Excused

1. **Welcome Time:** 3:14 PM

2. **Approve Agenda**

MOTION: Lazaro Cardenas/Jonny Ta	**VOTE:** unanimous-8

3. **Approve Minutes 04/18/2014**

MOTION: Alex Taliaferro/ Johnny TA	**VOTE:** unanimous-8

4. **Liam:**
   - Last week we went over subcommittee A, but we did not have a motion for the International Resource Center. First we need to make a decision on the International Resource Center and then go over Subcommittee B.

5. **International Resource Center:**
   a. If we do not give them the fund they are going to appeal and they are still going to get the capital reserves from us.
   b. The Dean is paying half of the lease so they just need funding for the other half.
   c. ISRC has $330,000 in permanent funding from SSF. They also have $82,000 that the Chancellor allocated to support international students. The $82, 000 was the money from non-resident tuition because they pay double. That money should be used to cover the lease.
   d. SSFAC should not cover their lease because it is not for educational purpose, it is based on infrastructure.
   e. We can always choose not to fund them and have more questions for them. We can also ask subcommittee A to go back to talk to them about logistically why they are not getting money from the general fund.
   f. **No Funding and instead recommend that they come to SSFAC for programing and less crucial parts of the department.**

MOTION: Alex Taliaferro/Lazaro Cardenas	**VOTE:** 6/1/1-Motion carries

6. **Subcommittee Review:**
   - **Subcommittee B(Terrence and Alex):**
   a. **Child Development Center**
      i. CDC is a place where students with families can take their children because the center provides infant classes up to two year olds, and three to five year olds.
      ii. CDC is one center but it is two buildings and within the building they are going to try to separate it into title 22 and title 5 if they do not receive the grant they applied for. This means that the teachers will have more

students and that takes away the child development. The CDC is not a child care; it is a child development center. The paying parents will be moved to one side of CDC and the nonpaying students are going to stay with title 5 because the grant pays for their children to be able to attend the center. Those parents that do not qualify for low income pay about $880 for the children to attend the CDC. They really need the grant to keep CDC functioning properly.

iii.   They are asking for nine staff positions. Last year we did not fund their addenda request is because of their questionable fiscal situation. It was suggested that they were not able to properly handle their budget at the time. This year the Chancellor is offering to clear their debt, which is quite a large amount if they provided a zero based budget. Another Student Services Fee they did received last year was totally based on teacher salaries.

iv.   Alex and Terrence recommend funding the first five positions because they serve a small population of the students although for the students that they do serve it is absolutely crucial or they would not be able to attend school if they did not have the child care for their children.

v.   We are unsure on where the Committee wants to draw the line on how much funding or position should we fund.

vi.   SSF allocation in permanent funding to CDC is $352,000 and parent's, contribution is over two million per year.

vii.   About 40 % of the children are student's children, then there are also faculty, staff and community children who are not subsidized and pay for their children's child care.

viii.   They applied for a grant that they did not receive last year, but they think they will receive it this year. The other question is what happens if they do not receive the grant?

ix.   Last year CDC was not funded because their structure was not well developed so it was not a smart idea to allocate more funding. We cannot allocate them permanent funding because they are asking for a lot of positions.

x.   This year they are looking for a new Director and with the new Director they might improve their structure.

xi.   It is important for those individuals that use the service so it is our responsibility to fund them because the students pay student service fees. We are not saying no to fund the center, were just saying it needs to develop more.

xii.   We are already funding $300, 000 plus the other recommendations which is another $300,000 totaling $600, 000. They have a $ 3 million budget. The 40% of the students that use CDC is about $1.2 million out of $3 million. We are only offsetting their cost of the percentage by half.

xiii.   It won't be detrimental if we do not fund the positions, they will still be able to function properly. If we fund these temporary positions they get

xiv. the impression that we are going to keep funding them. These are not new positions.

xiv. If they get the grant of $240,000 they won't need a lot of money for next fiscal year, but they are not sure they will get the grant. The money is not enough to cover the teachers for their center. CDC currently gets a $50,000 food grant. Dining Service covers $100,000 because the $50,000 does not cover the meals for the entire year. Housing and Dining Services pay the deficit.

xv. Last year they only requested four positions which equals to $278,000. This year their request increased substantially.

xvi. CDC is asking for a lot of positions. We cannot give them permanent allocations because Student Services Fee won't be able to sustain itself. The CDC structure is not well developed to be committing additional funds. They should not only rely on SSFAC.

xvii. Motion to table the discussion and vote.

MOTION: Johnny Ta/ Alex Taliaferro	**VOTE:** unanimous-8

- **Graduate Division:**
    i. Graduate Division trains and supports the graduate students on campus. They have programs such as Success Program to help retain students during their graduate career, T.A development which trains students to become T.As, and the Graduate Writing Center which is a new successful program. Grad Division had a 40% increase in employment. The National Science Fund helps write grant requests, which brings money to UCR. They make very good use of the money they receive. It is for PHD students and T.As working on their masters. The mentoring program is for first year PHD students and does not really focus on master students. This program helps retain students - about 50% of graduate students end up dropping.
    ii. We want their request to be reflective of the population. We are funding most of it, the only thing we wanted to change are the amounts for the graduate student writing consultant because their summer writing center they want twice the amount for the rest of a school year. Although they say this is because a lot of the grant applications are due during the summer, we felt that was excessive.
    iii. We also decided to cut the amount of coordinators by half for the Success Program.
    iv. We currently fund them $115,000 and they get $1million in General Funds.
    v. The mentor and writing are very important. The NSF program is very important because it helps students write a proposal. The students write their proposal during their first year, therefore, in summer they really don't need that much funding.

    vi. They are asking more funding for the summer because they want to provide jobs for students. That is when students may also have time to work on their grants, scholarships, etc.

   vii. Last year they were asking for 60 mentors and we funded them for 8 mentors, but they were able to get 31 mentors. This year they are asking for 30 mentors, but we recommend only funding for 15 mentors to see their results.

  viii. Priority 3 is very successful so we are recommending funding all of it.

   ix. Priority 4 we suggest two consultants. Alex believes that it is very important to fund for the summer and not take everything away from them.

    x. Fund $137, 921 for Graduate Division

MOTION: Lazaro Cardenas/Alex Taliaferro	**VOTE:** unanimous

- **Student Special Services:**
  i. Student Special Services provide accommodations for students with disabilities and veterans. They do OTC referrals, and voting registration.
  ii. Their first request is for the Veteran Service Coordinator. The Coordinator is very important to sustain the Veterans' services. Alex recommends funding it fully.
      a. It is a temporary ongoing. It is a critical position for the department.
  iii. The second request is Computer Resource Specialist or Alternative Media Specialist, which we did not fund last year because the committee felt it was not their responsibility because it is a legally mandated issue to accommodate students with disabilities. We recommend not funding it.
  iv. Their third request is for the annual license for clockwork database software. We recommend not funding it because last year we gave them funding for the original acquisition and the licensing cost and they have not implemented it. We subtracted $3,000 from the $2, 600 they were given last year to recommend $400. Between the two years they will have a total of $3,000 which is the current cost. At this point they are not using this software.
  v. The fourth priority is for the annual license for mandatory software and server fees.
  vi. The fifth priority is for the use of students with disabilities.
      a. Reading, writing, and listening skills. It is not state mandated it is a program they want to implement. We recommend funding it fully.
  vii. The sixth priority is an I Pad for alternative media specialist. We recommend funding at zero.
  viii. The seventh priority is upgrade for desktop. They requested 5, 000 which is a little too excessive.

a. We recommend $3,000 for 4 computers.

ix. The final request is a state mandated sign language interpreter. For example if a student needs someone to take notes for them they would take the money out of this fund. We believe it is a federal mandate so we should not fund it.

x. **Fund a total of $97, 971 for Student Special Services.**

MOTION: Alex Taliaferro	VOTE: unanimous

7. **Announcement:**
   - Sue - we are having a meeting on Tuesday 04/29/14

MOTION: Lazaro Cardenas/ Johnny Ta	**VOTE:** unanimous-7

8. **Adjournment:** 4:49 PM