

Council on Student Affairs and Fees (COSAF) Meeting
April 15, 2016
Garrison Room, Memorial Union
11:30 am – 1:00 pm

- I. Call to Order 11:37 am (Waiting for correction of projector issues)
 - Brief discussion regarding whether or not we had a quorum
- II. CCC SASI Presentation (Bruce Smail)
 - PowerPoint presentation is posted on the COSAF site
 - The 3 largest users of the center are white, Latino and middle-eastern students
 - Post-doctoral scholar is new this year
 - VIPs have work hours count toward their volunteer requirements
 - Question (MG) – What is a CAN counselor?
 - They are placed directly within several centers, e.g. WRRRC, to make access easier.
 - They are all part of the Health and Wellness Center, so they are not redundant
 - Terms Chicanx and Latinx were explained – used to express non-binary gender
 - Excel spreadsheets were presented and are also posted on the COSAF site
 - They used reserves for expenses that went about revenue
 - Michael R clarified that “Operating” included operating costs plus programming
 - Question (PG) – Why was no money allocated for student or career staff?
 - MR – They shifted salaries off this source and moved them to others, allocating funding sources for their most appropriate use
 - Question (NM) – Was the reducing of reserves/carry-forward intentional?
 - MR – reserves are drying up
 - The rise in admin costs impacted the carry-forward
 - JC clarified – The reduction is what should be happening. There was a collection of reserves in that account several years ago which shouldn’t have been there. The funds are being reduced as directed about 3 years ago. These funds should be in and out, used for programs
 - Contact points at CCC increased ~27,000 between 2010-11 and 2014-15
 - Question (MG) – What students participate in the 4 sponsored retreats?
 - Anyone. It is usually more culturally focused. REACH is more about social justice.
 - Attendance tends to be specific communities and first year students
 - Question – Do you pay for it all?
 - Mostly, but they charge a small fee, usually \$25-\$50, to ensure attendance, although they do cover the entire cost for students who can’t afford to go
 - Question (AZ) – I understand the reserve is to be spent down, but what is the plan once the reserves are spent?
 - MR – Will we be okay? We hope so! Campus has gone to a zero-based budget model. We are hopeful that the positions’ worth has been proven now.
- III. CA SASI Review (Teresa Gould, Mike Bazemore)
 - Teresa was called into a meeting with the Chancellor and was unable to attend
 - Question (MG) – What percent of the overall budget is SASI
 - MB – guessing about 30%
 - Question (MG) – Why are programming expenses increasing so much?
 - MB – Where we start with in projections is not always where we end up. For instance, enrollment was not as high as expected, so SASI was less than anticipated

- There are 99 different “colors” of money funding the unit, some of which are slated only for specific uses, so a swap of the more versatile funding has to happen. In the end, the actuals will likely look more like the prior year’s actuals than the projection.
- Question (NM) – what is the overtime (OT) issue?
 - MB – A lot of individuals currently fall into exempt classifications and do not earn overtime. The new regulation will raise the base salary for which positions qualify as exempt, so we’ll either have to raise salaries for these positions, or pay OT as necessary. This could be a big expense - \$200,000 or more; could be up to \$900,000...but that’s not possible, so we’ll have to figure it out!
 - Athletic departments across the country are very concerned. We don’t know the full details yet, but this could go into effect as early as July 1.
- Question (MG) – Are students’ medical costs paid?
 - MB – Only for costs related to injuries sustained as a student athlete. Coverage runs through the student’s primary care first and the university is required to pay the balance.
 - We are required to have health insurance for student athletes.
 - Question (MG) – does it cover other medical?
 - No, not what can go to SHWC – just athletics
 - Question (IW) – what percent of the budget is dedicated to medical costs?
 - \$500,000
 - Just insurance and supplies, not personnel
- Question (IW) – In the big picture, how healthy is ICA?
 - MB – I would not say we’re in good shape. Until the budget model changes it will always be a struggle. For instance, required campus increases are not covered within the budget, e.g. minimum wage increases, recharge costs, etc. Until that changes it will be tough
 - IW – Has ICA considered hiring an outside consultant to assess if there is a better model of operation?
 - Yes, about 4 years ago it was done, comparing to other kinds of schools to see where we fall. The Chancellor has brought in another consultant to benchmark how we sit compared to similar schools with similar programs – to that point, we’re low
 - IW- Because we’re relying on student fees?
 - MB – No, cost in CA is a big factor. Also, it costs us more than say, Sac State or Cal Poly. The benefit rate changed so that it is now the same for everyone, which affected ICA significantly. Their rate used to be lower since they tend to have a lot of young, single staff whose benefits cost less.
- Question (NM) – How have development efforts panned out this year?
 - MB – it takes 2-3 years for a new development officer to develop the contacts and trust to really expand a program. Now we have 3 funded by central development so we can operate on our own. So it has not helped for today, but hopefully by next year and beyond we can rely on that.
- Question (IW) – How much of the ICA budget comes from fees?
 - MB – with the 3 initiatives and SSF, about 75%
 - JC – without the SSF it would be about 60%
 - IW – Is there a comparable school that relies on student initiatives at this level?
 - MB – Institutional support is more common
 - At the higher levels, they get TV revenue

- At comparable levels it is supported between institutional support and student fees
 - IW – can we get more TV revenue?
 - MB – not likely. To do that we'd have to increase our costs significantly
 - IW – If moving up and staying the same are not working, what about moving down?
 - MB – not really possible. It would increase our costs in order to travel to the places we'd need to go in order to compete.
- IW – Since students fund 60% it seems they should have some say in what sports they want to see and which they think add the most benefits
 - MB – in 2010 we discontinued 4 sports due to financials. Anger about that still exists today.
 - The Chancellor says we're not cutting more sports
 - For the conference we're in, some sports are required.
 - Are there others? Yes, but there would be fallout if we had to drop one sport to add another
- IW – I just want to know that these things are being considered
 - MB – We're looking at it all the time!
- NM – Is it safe to say there's a striving for a different model?
 - MB – The Chancellor agrees that a new model is needed, but we don't know what.
 - JC – The issue of students as shareholders comes up often. At what level is the shareholdership level important? That's what the Chancellor grapples with all the time: the balance of the value to students vs efficacy
 - [There was more discussion of the changes and attention to value with the growth in student population.]
 - MB – CPI goes toward offsetting the cost of growth
- IW – Hat the student athlete population stayed the same?
 - MB – It dropped 4 years ago
 - IW – So why are students paying more for fewer? It's not logical. Seems like a management issue, like costs should have dropped.
 - MB – go back to costs, e.g. grounds – that doesn't decrease because we have fewer athletes. Medical costs are much higher than they were, even though there are fewer athletes.
 - Cost for the 4 eliminated sports should have reduced the overall.
- NM – Our overall ICA presentation did not help us understand the parts, but looking at the parts individually loses some of the big picture. Does anyone have more questions? (None raised) The discussion can be ongoing, and points included as we move along.

IV. CRU SASI Review (Laura Hall)

- Question (NM) – How much do fields cost?
 - LH – as an example, it costs \$700,000 to renovate fields
 - It is critical to have reserves for this because when it's needed, there are safety and risk management issues at play
- Clarified where the Dairy Field is
- What about outdoor stuff like basketball courts? How much do NON-students use that?
 - LH – good point. If something was built with student fees you will see access control. If there are non-controlled access facilities (e.g. outdoor basketball courts), University funds contributed to it.
- Question (PG) – What about the wage increase?

- LH – So far we have absorbed it, but we may not be able to continue
- PD – How many people were affected?
 - LH – all the students. It was an across-the-board increase
 - We have some contracts for positions that can't be filled by students
- IW – About how many hours do students work?
 - LH – Probably about 15 hr/week. The expected average is to be less than 20.
 - IW – So, for ~ 30 weeks/year?
 - LH – No, more like 52 in most Recreation areas
 - IW – So, ~\$300,000
 - LH – Yes, that's about what it was
- Question – What about the cost for space rental
 - You'll see that anything supported by student fees will have two prices, e.g. ARC members and the general community
- Question (NM) – So programs and camps make money?
 - LH – Yes, we count heavily on that revenue
- Question (PG) – What was the cut in operating expenses?
 - LH – refers to things like office supplies, fewer port-a-potties needed for events, Guest Services scaled down at MU
- Other questions? (No)

V.

Chairs Update

- (NM) How does everyone feel about the new template model? It was done with the thought that we can compare apples to apples in the materials, and we can come in with our questions and spend less time on the presentations. [Model is generally liked.]
 - IW – We may want to add questions.
 - NM – Send questions to chairs if you have suggestions of things to be added
- (NM) We want to answer questions regarding SSF that were brought up in that discussion and begin to formulate recommendations for the end of the year.
- JC Updates
 - Adela does want to get back here
 - Regarding the new referenda (The Aggie and TGIF), they have all gone through the UCOP process. UCOP endorsed them. The Chancellor has been alerted to UCOP support. Now it goes through the formality of sending them to the President for her support, then we can enact them.
 - (NM) The Regents have delegated approval of the referenda to the UC President.
 - (JC) Technically, all referenda are advisory to the President
 - (PD) There'd be fall out if she didn't approve!
 - (JC) Yes, but her approval is to be sure we do the process. UCOP was very involved this time, which is different from previously, so it was very interesting.
- (NM) Any more items? (No) Thanks for today's participation.
- Question (JC) – Will the vote for SASI be in the next meeting?
 - (NM) Most likely
- (NM) If anyone wants more information from any unit, let Naftali know so we can get them back in here for discussion.

VI.

Meeting adjourned 12:55 pm