

University of California San Francisco
CHANCELLOR'S STUDENT SERVICES FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
January 29, 2019

Members Present: Elizabeth Tinoco (Chair), Leena Dolle, Soren Jonzzon, Max Ladow, William Lee, Tannia Mackethan Rodriguez, Gina Ahmadyar, Kyle Navarro, Joseph Choe, Pingyang Liu

Ex-Officio Members Present: Shauna Strong

Staff Present: Carol Takao, Matthew Tout, Taylor Mayfield

Absent: Sharon Youmans, Lisa Raskulinec, Jennifer Rosko

1. Welcome & Introductions – Elizabeth opened the meeting.

2. January 16 Meeting Minutes Review & Approval – Minutes approved.

3. Unit Proposal Review – General Questions

Q: A further breakdown for who are the type of students that are using these services students versus non students. Many of the small increases seemed staff related.

A: Merits are generally projected in the years out in many of these for total staff salaries

Q: The 92K, is there a way to make decision knowing if we received it. Can we make decisions with both?

A: We can't wait for clarity; we should be focusing on the proposals as is. Mental Health services is a key focus with what the impact of funding should be. There is at least enough in reserves to continue Mental Health Services for another year without buyout funds.

Q: Buyout was supposed to cover 5%, but shouldn't the 92k actually be bigger?

A: The impact of return to aid being 50% comes straight out of the revenue increase results in a lesser return.

Q: When it's time to approve are we allowed to put stipulation on what they do as part of the approval?

A: We are aware that student's needs should be weighted heavily, but year to year this somewhat hard to enforce. Since we can't grow enrollment revenue is also flat and will remain so. You may ask these questions, but the amount of service fee funding is a small percentage of the actual funding.

Q: What are the chances of the 5% of coming back?

A: The environment is there will not be fee increases from the governor's office with next year very unlikely.

Q: What advice do you have for us when the departments present?

A: The questions being asked in the previous meeting and this meeting are excellent examples of what we should be asking.

Joe Choe explained his experience from the previous year and how difficult it was to make decision or make changes.

4. United Introductions and Presentations.

- **Wellness & Community** – Jennifer Mannix. The request is to maintain the same funding through 19-20 of \$68,144 with this department (Arts and Events) having merged with a sister department to form Wellness & Community.

Q: What's the Event Specialist 4 salary mean?

A: It's the team members time that devote effort to these events such as Jennifer.

Q: Could you elaborate what the other funds sources are

A: The largest being rate additive which is an internal type of tax on employees. Another is an endowment that has been bestowed upon UC's. Operations is another. 74K is from core funding.

Q: Last year we suggested that you should add more Mission Bay events. What happened?

A: two reasons, one being the merger. Great people events were a focus as well. In February, there is a plan to talk with students about what would be successful for Mission Bay. Construction impacts at mission bay canceled things like Block Party.

- **Family Services** – Laura Ishkanian. Request is for an increase of \$440 to cover 5% annual increase in the cost of Sittercity annual contract fee. We are obligated by contract to participate for another year and there has been an increase in student usage of this service.

Q: Do you have constructive criticism for these services?

A: People love free access to these services.

Q: Childcare is unaffordable; can these programs work on that issue?

A: These programs can't address that universal issue, but people love these services.

Q: Is there something else that can cover the \$440 request?

A: Funding is restricted.

Q: Is the 5% annual increase dependent on student use?

A: It's always standard via the contract. It's likely going to be written into the next contract. This was not a surprise, and next year we will likely be asking for the same increase.

Q: How many students who use Sittercity actually hire someone from this service?

A: We don't have the data this year because of the change that vendor did with their data portal. We have data from previous years, but not the most recent.

Q: We want to make sure that students can actually afford to use these services if they needed to offer a job to someone through Sittercity.

A: Childcare in SF is generally expensive, so this is a universal problem.

Q: Can the committee next year be provided the data.

A: Laura is working with the vendor to get this data available again.

Q: Can we have an anonymous survey as part of this service?

A: This is definitely something we can consider.

Q: Can you clarify the 154 total registrants (Not Only Students)

A: 154 total users but we can't tell who the users actually are because of how little information we get.

Q: How much is the value of Sittercity?

A: \$144 dollars per person with \$8,793 as the annual contract fee.

Q: We want more people to use this, don't we?

A: Yes, as there is no per person fee.

Q: Is it possible to pay per student?

A: Unfortunately, no that is not possible.

Q: Can we just put money aside to do this on an ad hoc basis?

A: No, this is the way the contract works.

Q: How do you advertise this service to students?

A: Presentations at orientations, mid-year gatherings and Synapse articles as well. Also, in newsletters, websites, social media, flyers, and tabling at campus events.

Q: If we didn't have Sittercity, what would be a good alternative?

A: Backup care would be helpful, but we see Sittercity as more affordable option.

Q: Are there other programs like Sittercity that are similar?

A: Other platforms exist like care.com which is very similar, but with Sittercity we can offer it to the entire community without having to segment it to certain populations.

Q: Is there a way to have our own site, like campus housing?

A: There is a bulletin board, but it's hardly ever used and will likely be shutdown. This is a large amount of administrative effort to keep these things going if they aren't used very much.

Q: Can we change the contract at all to Sittercity?

A: UCOP manages this on the entire UC level so we are unable to change these contracts.

- **Fitness & Recreation** – Steve Siskin. Request is for \$4,000 every year to cover the 4% increase. Students pay 5% of the 14million operating budget with students using 23%. Student fees are the lowest in the system because of the nonmember fees that help keep costs low.

Q: What are the rec pass fees? Are these funds completely separate from others in fitness?

A: The costs for hiring these guides, etc. is about 100k. the student services fees help in the larger pot to break close to even. 7 years ago it started at \$49 and its just \$74 now. If comparing to commercial options, this is a good value especially if you only use it even only once or twice.

Q: On slide 4, it recommends SSF be included in the CCC fee, please clarify?

A: This would make the funding permanent and stable. The second thing it's not really efficient to keep it spread over two funds. When Bakar opened, the referendum failed to extend access to it for students which this would help change.

- **Student Life** – Carol Takao & Maria ... Over 2 thousand events a year are hosted by this group and they are asking for the same funds from last year.

Q: On Slide 10, it was asked if the graphs represented time or funding?

A: Time by professional staff spent on events.

- **Office of Career & Professional Development** – Naledi Saul. Request is the same amount as previous years at \$499,131 supporting salary and benefits for professional staff. SSF supports about 1/3 of the budget for this office.

Q: What is your average wait time per appointment?

A: Depends on the time of year and type of programs. The goal is 1 week, but there is a Tuesday drop in planned.

Q: Are there different counselors for different programs?

A: Yes, IGHS is one example where we break up by researchers and clinicians.

Q: Are you guys in charge of connect UCSF. How does it work, and is it like LinkedIn?

A: Yes. The reason it exists is that alumni wanted to connect with current student and vice versa with the LinkedIn profile being pulled in with insights from alumni who would be willing to help connect students with other people for interviews, etc. This is still a new tool and the kinks are being worked out. Please come in and make an appointment to make sure things are working for you.

- **Student Health & Counseling Services** – Chaitali Mukherjee & Adele Anfinson. Request is for \$49,188.

Q: How would SHCS cover the funding if SSFAC were unable to allocate enough money?

A: Keeping safe staffing levels so layoffs are avoided.

Q: How exactly does SHCS use the referendum money?

A: Supplemental Fee is used to support existing staff salaries/benefits with the following staffing breaks downs; Primary Care NP (50% FTE), a Mental Health Counselor (80% FTE), and partial Admin Staff member (41% FTE) with salaries/benefits totaling \$319,364.

Q: Can you elaborate what “plans underway to continue expansion of mental health groups means”?

A: Slide 15- to clarify, the increase in budget will only be going towards salaries and benefits and not towards increasing access to mental health services.

Q: Comparing slide 20-22 the SHCS supplemental fee revenue is projected to increase for the 2019-2020 year which aligns with the student health referendum that passed last year which proposed that the SHCS increase as: \$48 (year 1- 2018-2019), \$50 (y2), \$53 (y3), \$56(y4). \$59 (y5), \$64(y6). How are these funds being used compared to the proposed \$49,188 SSF increase?

- A: The \$49,188 increase is the “SSF Mental Health Allocation” for mental health services. These funds can only be used for the support of direct mental health services. We will be hiring NEW staff with the SSF Mental Health funds.

Q: What are the plans for the expansion of mental health groups?

A: A clinical groups model to meet needs which is launching this quarter. There is a therapeutic need which this group can meet with expansion.

Q: What is the \$49,188 going into exactly?

A: This is going purely into funding mental health services, not administrative costs, etc.

Q: Are premiums increasing?

A: It's expected to increase 7.8% at an annual increase of 395 dollars which is a pass through.

Q: As far as increasing the number events, are these different than these therapeutics?

A: The therapeutic model is in addition with outreach programs still occurring.

- **Graduate & Professional Development** – Loreen Atallah. Request is for \$20,247 which is the same as previous years with no new funding requested.

Q: Do you know what your reserve is at?

A: 43K, and we have a plan to spend down the reserve with two proposals in the works. Possible plans being renting chargers out and obtaining microwaves with more programs in the process of being voted on.

Q: How much money do you think you'll be voting on funding?

A: Difficult to say but with one proposal to replace org sync the entire reserve would be spent.

Proposal Discussion – Committee only

This is a good time to think of additional questions, with an opportunity to email specific units to allow them time to respond. After the next meeting, the Chair will help write the letter to the Chancellor.

Future Meeting Dates:

Tuesday, March 5, 2019