

1. Brief Process Announcements

As a brief introduction, Bené reviewed process changes and reminders to support today’s work:

- Today’s meeting would have more structure such as time-limited items and “parking lot” for future issues.
- To better support CACSSF’s decision-making role, more background would be provided.
- Reminders included encouraging everyone to speak up if you have a different opinion and ability to call for caucus time with your group.

2. Decisions on Student Services Fee Funding Proposals

The amount of funding approved as of the November 13 meeting as well as amount of funding remaining was reviewed. For each proposal, status from November 13 meeting was reviewed and then discussion was continued. At the end of this agenda item, all decisions were reviewed and re-verified.

The outcomes were as follows:

#	Project	\$ / “Pot”	Outcome
A1	ASUC Perspectives Multicultural Perspectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$46,000 to be used over a period of up to two years • CACSSF pot 	Decision: Fund along with statement that encourages the ASUC to use this funding to develop a sustainable funding model that does not rely on SSF funding as the primary funding source for this event
A5	Big Ideas@Berkeley: Fostering Student Led Innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$50,000 spring 2013 • CACSSF pot 	Decision: Do not fund
A6	GA Student Programming Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$45,000 July 2013+ • Recurring pot 	Decision: Recommend to the Chancellor
B1	Study Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$6,920 spring 2013 • CACSSF pot • \$27,840 July 2013+ • Two funding options (CACSSF pot or one-time/short-term pot) 	<p>Decision: Fund \$6,920 from CACSSF pot for Spring 2013; do not fund \$27,840 at this time; request that data be collected during spring semester</p> <p><u>Action item:</u> CACSSF’s ideas for specific data to be collected will be gathered via email</p>

3. Lessons Learned for Spring’s CACSSF’s Student Services Fee Process

This was the first year that CACSSF had its new discretionary fund of Student Services Fee (SSF) funding to allocate. In order to learn from the process and be able to start the spring SSF process earlier in the semester, we scheduled time at this meeting for feedback. Possible questions to consider included: If you could change one thing, what would it be? Was there anything that you didn’t have that would have made the process easier? What worked well?

The feedback from CACSSF was as follows:

- Desire for a document repository and a website
- A lot of proposals were put forward by those who sit on CACSSF—concern about groups who don't know about the funding and process
- Should have a discussion about an outreach and marketing plan
- Intimidation factor for those who don't know the process
- Need a website: maybe use some of the CACSSF money to do that
- System to submit proposals online
- Another factor why some student service unit(s) haven't applied: student services fee funding is seen as a fragile funding source because of how the campus has cut it historically
- Like to see CACSSF re-assess the intended uses of Student Services Fee funding
 - Link these to outreach and marketing
 - Use data on student needs to inform the intended uses (e.g., student mental health, equity and inclusion)
- CACSSF can identify the top areas we'd like to see
- Would have liked to have heard from director's of departments (to see if they had shared commitments)
- Proposals—if lots of questions, bring in, ideally someone who doesn't sit on the committee
- If CSF has write-ups, attach them
- Bring student survey results to CACSSF
- Liked that we had the flexibility to make decisions when ready
- Liked that the proposal form improved from last year to this year

Recommendation for improving the miscellaneous student fee process: Make CSF recommendations more clear. It was unclear what was from the department vs. what was from CSF.

4. Decisions on Fee Recommendations to the Chancellor: Miscellaneous Student Fee Proposals

Hugh provided a brief overview of miscellaneous student fees (MSF) vs. course material fees (CMF). In addition, Bené reviewed a December 2011 breakdown of MSF vs. CMFs by campus academic departments. This document showed that academic departments typically pick either the route of CMF or MSF as way to help provide a supplemental educational experience for students.

Bené also shared the following criteria considerations drawn from the campus policy on miscellaneous student fees (<http://budget.berkeley.edu/policies/Docs/MiscStudentFeePolicy.pdf>):

- Does the purpose relate to one the following?
 - Covering the cost of non-instructional services or materials;
 - Encouraging compliance with administrative rules;
 - Replacing or repairing equipment which is damaged by students beyond normal wear and tear;
 - Recovering costs through rental charges for the student's use of University-owned tools, musical instruments, or other equipment; or
 - Covering the cost of other materials or services necessary to provide a special supplemental educational experience of direct benefit to the student.
- Do the following principles exist?
 - A reasonable relationship between the fee and its purpose should exist;
 - A fee should supplement but not supplant campus operating funds;
 - A fee should not be levied if the administrative cost of the fee will be greater than the benefits received;
 - Fee increases should be kept moderate and gradual where possible; and
 - Students should advise departments and the Chancellor on miscellaneous student fees.

As noted in the November 26 meeting notes, the Budget Office forwarded questions from CACSSF to the College of Environmental Design (CED). Answers from CED were distributed to CACSSF prior to this meeting. Given the number of questions that had arisen, Assistant Dean Patty Mead was invited to CACSSF to address any additional questions that arose. There was a short question and answer session, and then Assistant Dean Mead left before any voting occurred.

CACSSF voted to recommend to the Chancellor that the following CED proposals be approved:

- Large scale scanning
- Fabrication shop
- Proposals 6b-d and 7b-d which involved increases due to previous calculation errors in proposals formerly submitted to CACSSF
- Note: the other proposals were not discussed as the increases were exclusively related to sales tax

At the end of this agenda item, all decisions were reviewed and re-verified.

5. Miscellaneous Student Fees: Emerging Sales Tax Issue

This policy agenda item was tabled until early spring semester.

Action item: An adhoc group will meet and identify issues prior to it appearing on a CACSSF agenda. Group members to include: Bahar, Deanna, Olivier, Hugh and Bené.

6. Meeting Wrap-up

Action item: Concern was raised regarding how CACSSF might work to safeguard that when departments receive new Student Services Fee funding their budgets are not cut the same amount. Some initial ideas were raised and this will be put on the agenda for a CACSSF meeting in early spring.

Harry and Olivier thanked everyone for a very productive and successful semester. There was also recognition for Bianca Suarez and Rachel Tenney for their service to CACSSF as they move on to new endeavors; they will be missed.

Attendees: Nondorft, Covello, Abassi, Landgraf, Le Grande, Alwafai, Bouan, Schak, Fabrizio, Hoffman, Hoople, Navab, Suarez, Presti, Poullard, Keithley, Heller, Graham, Gatzert, Rouse

Version December 11, 2012. Any suggested additions or corrections should be submitted via the CACSSF listserv or to Bené Gatzert at bene@berkeley.edu. Corrected minutes will be redistributed to the committee.