



REGISTRATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE, 0015
OFFICE: (858) 534-384
FAX: (858) 534-1340

9500 GILMAN DRIVE
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0015
[HTTP://REGFEE.UCSD.EDU](http://REGFEE.UCSD.EDU)

FINAL

Report from the 2009-2010 Registration Fee Advisory Committee
To
Vice Chancellor-Student Affairs Penny Rue

*Recommendations on Budget Reduction Priorities for 2010-2011
Submitted by Erik Van Esselstyn, Chairman
May 28, 2010*

In response to the charge letter submitted to the Registration Fee Advisory Committee in Fall 2009, the Committee respectfully submits the following recommendations for the 2010-11 fiscal year.

The Registration Fee Advisory Committee was charged this year with the review of all clusters/units under Student Affairs, both State and Registration Fee-funded. In response to continued cuts to the University of California, the Committee again performed a priority analysis of the units in terms of their programs and services. This process began with an interview of each cluster/unit by a team of two to five members of the Committee. After reviewing the prepared budget reduction scenarios with the cluster/unit during the interview, each team was responsible for communicating the rationale behind these budget priorities to the entire Committee by way of a written report. The unit heads were then invited to present to the Committee and provide clarification on the impact that reductions would have on programs and services. For the first part of the deliberative process, the Committee evaluated the units and their core missions according to the intrinsic value provided to UCSD students, irrespective of possible reductions. Additionally, the Committee referred to the budget reduction scenarios prepared by the units in order to gauge the effects of various cut levels to the student experience. These approaches resulted in two priority criteria by which the units were ranked and which are detailed in the following pages. The Committee felt that two separate rankings allowed for a more thorough review of the student perspective, considering the possible ambiguity of a single list and the complexity of the task at hand.

In order to maintain consistency with commitments established by past Committees and to avoid irreversible impairment to programs and services lacking permanent funding, the Committee also considered returning requests for temporary funding. Due to the severity

UCSD REGISTRATION FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2010-2011

- 2 -

of upcoming budget reductions, the Committee was provided only temporary funds- the traditional \$200,000 along with the current year equivalent of \$286,830 from carryover permanent funds- to allocate for 2010-2011. Out of \$139,483 in total requests, the Committee recommended to allocate \$109,465 as detailed in the attached report. The current balance of funds is outlined below:

	Permanent Funds	Temporary Funds
July 1, 2009 Balance Forward	\$286,830	\$271,044
10/11 Base Yearly Allocation	--	\$200,000
10/11 Funds Available	\$286,830	\$471,044
10/11 RFAC Recommendations	(\$0)	(\$109,465)
July 1, 2010 Balance Forward	\$286,830	\$361,579

In addition to the priority analysis and fund allocations, the Committee designed and administered a survey to obtain student feedback on Student Affairs units, planned upgrades to the Committee's website, and discussed the changes to the University of California Student Fee Policy.

As a result of the extent and significance of the changes to the Student Fee Policy, it is imperative that the conclusions from the Committee's discussions on the matter be recorded here. On May 20, 2010, the Regents of the University of California passed an amendment to the Student Fee Policy which renamed the Registration Fee as the Student Services Fee. Along with the change in name, the fee became subject to Guidelines dictated by the Office of the President. Upon close scrutiny of these Guidelines, the Committee expressed deep concern over the future oversight and implementation of the Student Services Fee. This concern manifested in particular with the knowledge that this year, over \$1.8 million had been removed from the base budget of the Registration Fee before reaching Student Affairs and without any student oversight. The Committee understands that under such large reductions in State funding, some Registration Fees must inevitably be committed to the general campus (in lieu of supporting State-funded units within Student Affairs,) but asserts that there must be a consistent level of student oversight for that process. In accordance with the new Student Fee Policy for the Student Services Fee, the Chancellor "shall solicit and actively consider student recommendations... [on] the use of Student Services Fee revenue," which dictates that in coming years, the Registration Fee Advisory Committee (hereafter referred to as the Student Fee Advisory Committee) shall not only be made aware of such uses of the Student Services Fee, but also be solicited for input on its use, regardless of where it is distributed on campus. It is the request of the Committee that the Student Services Fee budget report which is to be provided to all future Committees include as a part of the template a detailed account of all non-historical uses of the Student Services Fee (from its time as the Registration Fee.) This will support the retention of institutional memory the Committee believes may be lost with the change in name of the fee. Finally, section one

of the Guidelines states that the “primary use of Student Services Fee revenue should be for student services programs and activities that are not traditionally supported by State funds,” and that the Student Services Fee should merely be “prioritized for... Student Services Fee-funded programs.” This language alarmed the Committee, which adamantly opposed the use of up to 49% of the Student Services Fee for purposes outside of those intended by the students who pay it. The list of units following this language was also a point of major concern to the Committee: as the Guidelines are written, there are nine (the first nine on the list) traditionally and completely State-funded units which will now be open to receiving Student Services Fee funding. This is also adamantly opposed by the Committee, which stressed the dangers to traditional Registration Fee-funded units if these Guidelines were to be implemented at UCSD in their current form.

Since the onset of the most recent budget shortfalls within the University of California, the Registration Fee Advisory Committee has and will continue to adapt to its new role in analyzing and qualifying the reductions faced by units within Student Affairs. This year, the Committee built on the foundations of last year’s process, and it is hoped that such optimization will occur every year that the Committee is called upon to fulfill this capacity. To the achievement of that end, firstly, it is recommended that the 2010-2011 Student Fee Advisory Committee meet at the beginning of Fall Quarter 2010 as opposed to holding its traditional introductory meeting towards the end of the quarter. Student representative appointments were previously a limiting factor for this to occur; however, this year, in conjunction with normal committee appointments, the “shadow” program was reinstated, allowing “shadows” of representatives in the final year of their term to be appointed to the Committee as non-voting members. This not only provides the Committee more flexibility in the first quarter of the following year (when shadows become full members,) but also increases the institutional memory that is so crucial to fulfilling the Committee’s responsibilities. Especially in light of the changes to the Student Fee Policy, the Committee should allow as much time at the start of next year as possible to respond to new and unforeseen circumstances. Meetings can also be used to discuss the implications of the inaugural Student Services survey results, which should provide a valuable reference throughout the rest of the year.

Secondly, it is recommended that the 2010-2011 Student Fee Advisory Committee review the priority criteria used by this year’s Committee in order to develop their own funding priority model before the teams interview the clusters/units. This will serve two purposes: to provide a clear framework for the teams during the interviewing process and when writing their reports, and to better inform the clusters/units about what information the Committee requires and the manner in which it will be interpreted. Similarly, the list of units, programs, and services to be prioritized should be assessed and modified in conjunction with the cluster/unit interviews. Enacting a mock interview in front of the entire Committee would be another effective method of extracting the greatest benefit from the interview process.

In conclusion, the Registration Fee Advisory Committee would like to thank Penny Rue for her continued support of the functions of the Committee and her respect of the recommendations of students and staff during these difficult times. As well, the

UCSD REGISTRATION FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2010-2011

- 4 -

Committee would like to sincerely thank and acknowledge the services and support of Ed Spriggs for his insight on Student Affairs and the general campus, Josie Hollinger for her infallible knowledge and counsel on budgetary matters, and Catharine Nance for her hard work and flexibility in dealing with all of the Committee's needs.

I have been honored to work with a Committee of such talented and dedicated people, whose discerning opinions and exemplary intentions enabled us to accomplish so much this year. Every individual deserves to be recognized for their contribution to UCSD and to those who will follow them in the years to come.

Respectfully,

Erik Van Esselstyn
Chairman, Registration Fee Advisory Committee

Recommended Funding Priorities

'Value' Priority Criterion

This ranking reflects the intrinsic value to the student body of the sub-unit, service, or program as a part of the UCSD campus and experience, including but not limited to student life, academic support, campus community, and essential services. In this application, "value" is the absolute (as opposed to relative) importance to students with respect to the role played as a part of a university campus in general and UCSD specifically, where the greater the value, the more important the role in any given student's desired experience at UCSD as a university and unique community. "Value" is expressed as a single criterion under the assumption that many criteria contribute to it, varying widely in scope and strength, from any given student; these are understood and taken into account by the members fulfilling representative positions on the committee.

The purpose of this ranking is to provide a snapshot of UCSD's current organization of Student Affairs if it were to be prioritized for students, by students. This is expected to provide long-term guidance not necessarily for implementing budget reductions, but for strategic investments amidst downsizing and restructuring; sub-units, services, and programs that fall into the two highest value categories are recognized not merely as needing to be preserved, but strengthened, even at the expense of those that fall into the two lowest value categories.

Highest Value
<p><u>Counseling and Psychological Services</u> <i>Individual/Group Counseling Services/Workshops</i> A requisite service for preserving student well-being. The breadth and depth of offerings should be evaluated for effectiveness and efficiency.</p>
<p><u>Sexual Assault and Violence Prevention Resource Center</u> A requisite service for preserving student well-being.</p>
<p><u>Undergraduate Colleges</u> <i>College Deans of Student Affairs / Residential Life Offices (FTEs)</i> A critical element in retaining UCSD's unique character and memorable undergraduate experience. As one of the first points of contact for students, growth or reduction can have lasting effects on community identity.</p>
<p><u>Undergraduate Colleges</u> <i>Individual College Graduation Ceremonies</i> A critical element in retaining UCSD's unique character and memorable undergraduate experience. Can be enhanced to a point; diminishing returns</p>

<p>afterward.</p>
<p><u>Student Health Services</u> A requisite service for preserving student well-being. The breadth and depth of offerings should be evaluated to maximize student usage.</p>
<p><u>Admission and Enrollment Services</u> <i>Office of Admissions and Relations</i> <i>Registrar's Office: Walk-in/Enrollment/Transcripts/Tritonlink functions</i> Fulfills a vital function of the university. Continuing to invest in streamlining processes and services is encouraged.</p>
<p><u>Admission and Enrollment Services</u> <i>Financial Aid Office</i> A vital component of student accessibility to higher education; the services offered could not be completely or effectively duplicated any other way.</p>

High Value
<p><u>Career Services Center</u> <i>Student Employment Services on Campus</i> An important support service for students and employers that would be less effective and efficient if decentralized.</p>
<p><u>Career Services Center</u> <i>Graduate/Professional School Advising/Fairs for Undergraduates</i> <i>Career Exploration: Internship/Individual Advising / Fairs</i> Programs and services fulfill a primary objective of the university complementary to instruction. Growth or reduction may directly affect student prospects after graduation.</p>
<p><u>Student Legal Services</u> <i>Legal Counseling</i> A unique and valuable service which could offer greater value by more effectively reaching the student population. For its current size, its obscurity remains a helpful limiting factor.</p>
<p><u>International Center</u> <i>Study Abroad Programs (EAP / OAP)</i> Programs and services fulfill a primary objective of the university complementary to instruction.</p>

<p><u>International Center</u> <i>Foreign Student Advising</i> A valuable and unique service for its targeted student population.</p>
<p><u>Sports Facilities</u> A principle contributor to campus atmosphere; facilitates many types of student-centered events.</p>
<p><u>Office of Graduate Studies</u> <i>Graduate Fellowship Advising</i> One of the most valuable and necessary services for graduate students.</p>
<p><u>Undergraduate Colleges</u> <i>Dean's Office College Programming</i> Contributes to UCSD's unique character and memorable undergraduate experience. Can be supplemented by college activity fees, but reduces flexibility for community building.</p>
<p><u>Office of Graduate Studies</u> <i>Graduation Ceremony / Commencement</i> An important part of the graduate student experience.</p>
<p><u>Student Educational Advancement</u> <i>Outreach Programs (e.g. EAOP, Cal-Soap)</i> Programs contribute to the university community in a unique and lasting way; however, difficult to judge direct benefit to students and overall effectiveness.</p>
<p><u>Office of Academic Support and Instructional Services</u> <i>Tutoring</i> A valuable service for student retention. Current model could be optimized to support targeted students.</p>

No Preference

<p><u>Counseling and Psychological Services</u> <i>Peer Education Program</i> Broadens the reach of an essential service while offering unique opportunities for students, but not essential by itself.</p>
<p><u>Office of Academic Support and Instructional Services</u> <i>Summer Bridge Program</i> A lauded program with restrictively high cost per student. Consequently, serves</p>

<p>a small number of students; value is diminished.</p>
<p><u>Campus Recreation</u> <i>Intramural Sports</i> A relevant, appreciated, but non-vital program in its contribution to student well-being. As the broadest reaching of the sports programs, holds the greatest value to students.</p>
<p><u>Center for Student Involvement</u> <i>Student / Greek Org Advising</i> A heavily utilized service that supports campus culture, but could be streamlined through electronic processes.</p>
<p><u>University Events Office</u> <i>The Loft</i> A unique venue that provides valued but nonessential programming. Requires student buy-in to increase value.</p>
<p><u>Student Wellness</u> <i>Wellness Center</i> An unproven platform for valuable programs and services; effectiveness should be monitored.</p>
<p><u>Student Educational Advancement</u> <i>Academic Enrichment Programs (AEP)</i> Programs provide connections to valuable experiences that complement instructional mission of the university, but are not vital.</p>
<p><u>Campus Recreation</u> <i>Classes</i> A worthwhile offering to create breadth within the program, but not necessary.</p>
<p><u>Campus Recreation</u> <i>Weight Rooms</i> A heavily utilized service, but would not lose a significant portion of its value if hours of operation were reduced.</p>
<p><u>Student Health Services</u> <i>Programs / Outreach</i> A beneficial program for those involved and the targeted students; ancillary to the purpose of the unit.</p>
<p><u>Office of Graduate Studies</u> <i>New Student Orientation</i></p>

<p>A useful but underutilized program that is not vital to the Graduate student experience.</p>
<p><u>University Events Office</u> <i>ArtPower! Programs (e.g. music, dance, film)</i> Longstanding, dynamic programs that would offer greater value by more effectively reaching the student population; a unique but non-vital part of the student experience.</p>
<p><u>Student Life</u> <i>Student Activities Office (SBO)</i> Facilitates student-run events on campus, an important part of a university experience; methods and practices should be streamlined to increase value.</p>
<p><u>Intercollegiate Athletics Program</u> Maintaining these programs and services under the current level of administrative oversight contributes to the student experience, though it is not completely vital.</p>
<p><u>Express to Success Programs</u> On par with some of the most successful programs on campus. Growth is encouraged, though not at the expense of more vital services.</p>

Low Value	
<p><u>Campus Recreation</u> <i>Sports Clubs</i> Offers breadth without adding significant value due to required student costs.</p>	
<p><u>Student Wellness</u> <i>Programs</i> Since the formation of the cluster, these programs have been limited; it is yet to be seen what value will be added as they expand.</p>	
<p><u>University Centers</u> <i>Commuter Student Services</i> In light of what University Centers supports, these funds create little value.</p>	
<p><u>University Events Office</u> <i>Box Office</i> A useful service that would have greater value if it were closer to being self-supporting.</p>	

<p><u>Office of Graduate Studies</u> <i>Graduate Community Collaborative Projects</i> Narrow programming is limited in its ability to foster a sense of community among graduate students; ultimately, not necessary.</p>
<p><u>Center for Student Involvement</u> <i>Leadership Development Programs (Passport, Excel, Advance)</i> Though appreciated, programs lack substantial innate value due to the opportunity for practicing leadership roles across campus.</p>
<p><u>Center for Student Involvement</u> <i>Community Service Opportunities</i> A nonessential service that is duplicated (through a decentralized approach) by many individual organizations.</p>
<p><u>Center for Student Involvement</u> <i>Community Law Project</i> A small program that does not hold significant value due in part to its limited scale and the possibility for near-duplication of its benefits through other avenues.</p>

Lowest Value
<p><u>Student Legal Services</u> <i>Legal Education Workshops</i> A nonessential program that holds little value for students given the time spent out of office by the coordinators (which could be used for legal counseling.)</p>
<p><u>Student Legal Services</u> <i>Discover the Law Program</i> While successful in educating students on specific legal topics, the value of the program in light of the availability of individual legal counseling is very limited.</p>
<p><u>Office of Graduate Studies</u> <i>Graduate Enrichment Program (GEP)</i> Educationally supplemental programming that could be taken care of on a departmental basis, if at all.</p>
<p><u>Office of Graduate Studies</u> <i>All-Grad Research Symposium</i> An educationally supplemental program that could be taken care of on a</p>

departmental basis; limited reach severely diminishes value.
<u>Campus Recreation</u> <i>Outback Adventures</i> A convenient service that is completely nonessential; should be self-supporting.
<u>Intergroup Relations Program</u> An underutilized and generally unsuccessful service that has little value in its current form.

‘Budget Reduction Impact’ Priority Criterion

This ranking reflects the negative impact to the UCSD campus and experience from a student perspective, (including but not limited to student life, academic support, campus community, and essential services,) of reductions taken at the levels of the provided scenarios. In this application, “impact” is the tangible decrease in unique benefits provided by the sub-unit, service, or program to the greatest of its targeted student populations, where the greater the impact, the greater irreversible impairment to any given student’s desired experience at UCSD as a university and unique community. As an important distinction between this and the ‘Value’ Priority criterion, the “impact” is ranked only in terms of the current budget reduction scenarios. Because reductions are applied to a unit as a whole and not to individual programs and services, the impact of most programs and services within a unit was decided as a collective. Those that differ from the rest of the programs and services within their unit were either targeted or neglected disproportionately as a part of the reduction scenario.

The purpose of this ranking is to provide direct guidance for the appropriation of reductions in the 2010-11 Registration Fee budget; the highest ranked of these should be insulated from budget reductions as much as possible, the middle should receive partial reductions as necessary, and the lowest should be targeted first for any reductions. (The five degrees of priority seen in the value ranking were reduced to three in order to simplify the practical implementation of these recommendations.)

Highest Impact
<u>Counseling and Psychological Services</u> <i>Individual/Group Counseling Services/Workshops</i> <i>Peer Education Program</i> A reduction of FTEs within this unit would directly affect student well-being.
<u>Sexual Assault and Violence Prevention Resource Center</u>

<p>A reduction of FTEs within this unit would directly affect student well-being.</p>
<p><u>Undergraduate Colleges</u> <i>College Deans of Student Affairs / Residential Life Offices (FTEs)</i> A reduction of FTEs within this unit would directly affect the undergraduate student experience; the Deans' Offices are already running very lean.</p>
<p><u>Undergraduate Colleges</u> <i>Individual College Graduation Ceremonies</i> For any cost savings here, there would be a disproportionately negative effect to the culminating event of a student's experience.</p>
<p><u>Career Services Center</u> <i>Student Employment Services on Campus</i> <i>Graduate/Professional School Advising/Fairs for Undergraduates</i> <i>Career Exploration: Internship /Indiv Advising / Fairs</i> Cuts would significantly affect one of the most important secondary functions of the university: facilitating career decisions and opportunities. Revenue exploration should be a primary goal. The priorities represented in the scenarios do not align with those of the Committee.</p>
<p><u>Student Legal Services</u> <i>Legal Counseling</i> <i>Legal Education Workshops</i> <i>Discover the Law Program</i> Any reduction in coordinator FTEs would greatly affect the ability of the unit to perform the functions valued by students.</p>
<p><u>International Center</u> <i>Study Abroad Programs (EAP / OAP)</i> <i>Foreign Student Advising</i> Fees and revenues should be increased before losing any FTEs, as they support an important part of the student experience.</p>
<p><u>Sports Facilities</u> One of the most visible aspects of campus life would be severely impacted. Transference of FTEs to alternate sources should be first step, not last. Referendum should continue to be a major focus, as well as utilizing last year's allocation for cost saving practices.</p>
<p><u>Office of Graduate Studies</u> <i>Graduate Fellowship Advising</i> Should be prioritized above other services to graduate students as it more directly affects their experience and is already part of an understaffed office.</p>

Office of Academic Support and Instructional Services

Summer Bridge Program

The implementation of a fee to cover the program is not supported as it would restrict access for the intended students.

Medium Impact

Student Health Services

Health Services

Programs / Outreach

Copay fees should be instated before any reductions are made in hours of operation, FTEs, or programs.

Admission and Enrollment Services

Office of Admissions and Relations

Registrar's Office: Walk-in/Enrollment/Transcripts/Tritonlink functions

Though vital as a unit, the reduction in programs would not have a large impact on current students. No services would be significantly reduced that could not be bolstered by revenue sources.

Undergraduate Colleges

Dean's Office College Programming

Could be supplemented with support from Student Activity Fees.

Office of Graduate Studies

Graduation Ceremony / Commencement

New Student Orientation

Graduate Community Collaborative Projects

Graduate Enrichment Program (GEP)

All-Grad Research Symposium

Relatively small investment for relatively small impact.

Student Educational Advancement

Outreach Programs (e.g. EAOP, Cal-Soap)

Academic Enrichment Programs (AEP)

Moving proposed FTEs onto other funding sources or eliminating them should not have irreversible impact. Impact will be further minimized if priorities are reordered, namely in the case of instituting a charge for OASIS tutoring.

Campus Recreation

Intramural Sports

Classes

<p><i>Weight Rooms</i> <i>Sports Clubs</i> <i>Outback Adventures</i></p> <p>Cuts will moderately affect the value offered by the unit. Revenue generating alternatives should be explored, as well as transferring positions onto the RIMAC fee.</p>
<p><u>Center for Student Involvement</u> <i>Student / Greek Org Advising</i></p> <p>Reductions to this service would impact students, but not irreversibly.</p>
<p><u>Student Life</u> <i>Student Activities Office (SBO)</i></p> <p>Should utilize all of the flexibility available in UCEN funding and explore means of revenue generation to ensure FTEs in order to limit impact to students.</p>
<p><u>University Events Office</u> <i>The Loft</i> <i>ArtPower! Programs</i> <i>Box Office</i></p> <p>Should utilize all of the flexibility available in UCEN funding and explore means of revenue generation to ensure FTEs in order to limit impact to students.</p>
<p><u>Student Wellness</u> <i>Wellness Center</i> <i>Programming</i></p> <p>Should prioritize the integration of business services across the cluster in order to maximize potential as a new campus entity and cost savings.</p>
<p><u>University Centers</u> <i>Commuter Student Services</i></p> <p>University Centers has already taken over responsibility for this funding.</p>

Low Impact

<p><u>Admission and Enrollment Services</u> <i>Financial Aid Office</i></p> <p>Proposed reductions would have little or no effect on operations.</p>
<p><u>Office of Academic Support and Instructional Services</u></p>

<p><u>Tutoring</u> Instituting a nominal charge will not only decrease the negative impact to the unit, but increase the positive impact the service has on students.</p>
<p><u>Intercollegiate Athletics Program Administration</u> Due to alternative fee revenue, cuts would not irreversibly impact the student experience.</p>
<p><u>Center for Student Involvement</u> <i>Leadership Development Programs (Passport, Excel, Advance)</i> <i>Community Service Opportunities</i> <i>Community Law Project</i> No impact on the service or to students in the proposed scenarios.</p>
<p><u>Express to Success</u> Even with the proposed FTE reduction, impact to the students participating in this successful program would be minimal.</p>
<p><u>Intergroup Relations Program</u> The impact of proposed reductions to the service would be minimal. Should be considered for larger reductions.</p>

‘Budget Reduction Scenario Percentage Propriety’ criterion

This ranking reflects how appropriate the delegation of budget reduction scenario percentages to each of the units was, considering the relative impact on each unit compared with the others. Unlike the other two criteria, this is strictly comparative in nature; the purpose of the ranking is to provide feedback on the usefulness and applicability of the scenarios and to determine whether a higher or lower percentage budget reduction scenario would provide a more valuable exercise in the future (in that the units could be more evenly compared.) Since the ‘Budget Reduction Impact Priority’ ranking is based heavily on the information provided in the scenarios, the significance of their comparative “impacts” is great. These adjustments should be considered during next year’s call for budget reduction scenarios.

Decrease Reduction Scenarios
<p><u>Undergraduate Colleges</u> <i>College Deans of Student Affairs / Residential Life Offices (FTEs)</i> <i>Individual College Graduation Ceremonies</i> <i>Dean's Office College Programming</i></p>

Considering what is accomplished through the Deans' Offices, their small size and stretched resources provide ample reason to lower the reduction scenarios.

Career Services Center

Student Employment Services on Campus

Graduate/Professional School Advising/Fairs for Undergraduates

Career Exploration: Internship/Individual Advising / Fairs

A freestanding unit with limited options for reductions considering the nature of its revenue source. The actions proposed in the reduction scenarios do not align with student priorities; lowering the scenarios may help to solve that issue.

Increase Reduction Scenarios

Sports Facilities

The effects represented in the reduction scenarios do not represent an equivalent impact to students compared with those in other units' scenarios. The proposed levels should be increased.

Campus Recreation

Intramural Sports

Classes

Weight Rooms

Sports Clubs

Outback Adventures

The effects represented in the reduction scenarios do not represent an equivalent impact to students compared with those in other units' scenarios. The proposed levels should be increased. This is partially reflective of the possibility for alternative revenue sources.

Appendix: Priority Criteria Ranking Spreadsheets

Blue = Highest Value/Impact / Decrease Scenarios

Green = High Value

Orange = Low Value

Red = Lowest Value/Impact / Increase Scenarios

Value Ranking

Unit	Program Area	Value	Cut Impact	% Cut Scenarios
CAPS	Individual/Group Counseling Services/Workshops			5 10 15
SARC	Sexual Assault and Violence Prevention Resource Center			5 10 15
Ugrad	College Deans of Student Affairs / Residential Life Offices (FTEs)			10 20 30
Ugrad	Individual College Graduation Ceremonies			10 20 30
SHS	Student Health Services			10 20 30
AES	Office of Admissions and Relations			5 10 15
AES	Registrar's Office: Walk-in/Enrollment/Transcripts/Tritonlink			5 10 15
AES	Financial Aid Office			5 10 15
CSC	Student Employment Services on Campus			20 35 50
CSC	Graduate/Professional School Advising/Fairs for Ugrads			20 35 50
CSC	Career Exploration: Internship/Fairs/Indiv Advising			20 35 50
SLS	Legal Counseling			5 10 15
IC	Study Abroad Programs (EAP / OAP)			10 20 30
IC	Foreign Student Advising			10 20 30
SF	Sports Facilities (e.g. fields, courts)			20 35 50
OGS	Graduate Fellowship Advising			10 20 30
Ugrad	Dean's Office College Programming			10 20 30
OGS	Graduation Ceremony / Commencement			10 20 30
SEA	Outreach Programs (e.g. EAOP, Cal-Soap)			10 20 30
OASIS	Tutoring			10 20 30
CAPS	Peer Education Program			5 10 15
OASIS	Summer Bridge Program			10 20 30
Rec	Intramural Sports			20 35 50
CSI	Student / Greek Org Advising			10 20 30
UEO	The Loft			10 20 30
SW	Wellness Center			5 10 15
SEA	Academic Enrichment Programs (AEP)			10 20 30
Rec	Classes			20 35 50
Rec	Weight Rooms			20 35 50
SHS	Programs / Outreach			10 20 30
OGS	New Student Orientation			10 20 30
UEO	ArtPower! Programs (e.g. music, dance, film)			10 20 30
SL	Student Activities Office (SBO)			10 20 30
ICA	Intercollegiate Athletics Program Administration			20 35 50

UCSD REGISTRATION FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2010-2011

- 18 -

ETS	Express to Success Programs			10 20 30
Rec	Sports Clubs			20 35 50
SW	Student Wellness Programs (TBD)			5 10 15
UCEN	Commuter Student Services			10 20 30
UEO	Box Office			10 20 30
OGS	Graduate Community Collaborative Projects			10 20 30
CSI	Leadership Development Programs (Passport, Excel, Advance)			10 20 30
CSI	Community Service Opportunities			10 20 30
CSI	Community Law Project			10 20 30
SLS	Legal Education Workshops			5 10 15
SLS	Discover the Law Program			5 10 15
OGS	Graduate Enrichment Program (GEP)			10 20 30
OGS	All-Grad Research Symposium			10 20 30
Rec	Outback Adventures			20 35 50
ETS	Intergroup Relations Program			10 20 30

Cut Impact Ranking

Unit	Program Area	Cut Impact	Value	% Cut Scenarios
CAPS	Individual/Group Counseling Services/Workshops			5 10 15
SARC	Sexual Assault and Violence Prevention Resource Center			5 10 15
Ugrad	College Deans of Student Affairs / Residential Life Offices (FTEs)			10 20 30
Ugrad	Individual College Graduation Ceremonies			10 20 30
CSC	Student Employment Services on Campus			20 35 50
CSC	Graduate/Professional School Advising/Fairs for Ugrads			20 35 50
CSC	Career Exploration: Internship/Fairs/Indiv Advising			20 35 50
SLS	Legal Counseling			5 10 15
IC	Study Abroad Programs (EAP / OAP)			10 20 30
IC	Foreign Student Advising			10 20 30
SF	Sports Facilities (e.g. fields, courts)			20 35 50
OGS	Graduate Fellowship Advising			10 20 30
CAPS	Peer Education Program			5 10 15
OASIS	Summer Bridge Program			10 20 30
SLS	Legal Education Workshops			5 10 15
SLS	Discover the Law Program			5 10 15
SHS	Student Health Services			10 20 30
AES	Office of Admissions and Relations			5 10 15
AES	Registrar's Office: Walk-in/Enrollment/Transcripts/Tritonlink			5 10 15
Ugrad	Dean's Office College Programming			10 20 30
OGS	Graduation Ceremony / Commencement			10 20 30
SEA	Outreach Programs (e.g. EAOP, Cal-Soap)			10 20 30
Rec	Intramural Sports			20 35 50
CSI	Student / Greek Org Advising			10 20 30
UEO	The Loft			10 20 30

UCSD REGISTRATION FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2010-2011

- 19 -

SW	Wellness Center			5 10 15
SEA	Academic Enrichment Programs (AEP)			10 20 30
Rec	Classes			20 35 50
Rec	Weight Rooms			20 35 50
SHS	Programs / Outreach			10 20 30
OGS	New Student Orientation			10 20 30
UEO	ArtPower! Programs (e.g. music, dance, film)			10 20 30
SL	Student Activities Office (SBO)			10 20 30
Rec	Sports Clubs			20 35 50
SW	Student Wellness Programs (TBD)			5 10 15
UCEN	Commuter Student Services			10 20 30
UEO	Box Office			10 20 30
OGS	Graduate Community Collaborative Projects			10 20 30
OGS	Graduate Enrichment Program (GEP)			10 20 30
OGS	All-Grad Research Symposium			10 20 30
Rec	Outback Adventures			20 35 50
AES	Financial Aid Office			5 10 15
OASIS	Tutoring			10 20 30
ICA	Intercollegiate Athletics Program Administration			20 35 50
ETS	Express to Success Programs			10 20 30
CSI	Leadership Development Programs (Passport, Excel, Advance)			10 20 30
CSI	Community Service Opportunities			10 20 30
CSI	Community Law Project			10 20 30
ETS	Intergroup Relations Program			10 20 30