Student Fee Advisory Committee
January 22, 2016
Meeting Minutes

Present: Sherwynn Umali, Alexander Li, Haruka Hatori, Matthew Tsai, Tim Ma, Liuyi Pei, Parshan Khosravi, Valerie Sanchez, Kim Sadler, Kristine Jermakian, Chance Pardon

Absent: Felicia Martinez, Myron Lozano

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

1. January 15, 2016 meeting minutes approved.

2. 2016-17 Course Materials and Services Fee Proposals
   a. ENGR165/265 – Advanced Manufacturing
      i. Proposed $47.00 per student CMSF for supplies and printer time/costs and scanner costs for 3-D printing for manufacturing designs.
      ii. Continued discussion from last week.
      iii. Vote: Yes = 6; No = 0; Abstain = 0
   b. MAE 195 – Additive Manufacturing
      i. $115.00 for 3-D printing materials costs; department will cover printing/scanning costs.
      ii. The department previously covered the fee.
      iii. Vote: Yes = 5; No = 0; Abstain = 2
   c. ESS 114 – Field Methods Class
      i. $25.00 CMSF for field and lab materials.
      ii. Mandatory undergraduate course for over 200 undergraduate majors.
      iii. Expecting half the enrollment for the upcoming year, but the cost per student is the same.
      iv. How many scholarships and how much will the scholarship?
      vi. Why is the cost fluctuating?
      vii. Waste disposal costs are included. Should they be? The department tracks costs separately and are charged by waste pick up, so the department knows courses are generating the waste disposal costs. In the case of undergraduate labs, the course materials fee covers waste disposal generated by students in the lab.
      viii. The committee will defer the vote on CMSF proposal until ESS provides information on scholarships.
   d. ESS 115 – Aquatic Field Methods Class
      i. $25.00 CMSF for field trips.
      ii. Not a required course; optional course to fulfill field requirements.
      iii. Will there be scholarships for this?
iv. The committee will table the vote until ESS can answer the information on scholarships.

e. ESS 140 – Advanced Geology
   i. $100.00 CMSF for three-day field trip (cost of transportation, lodging food).
   ii. Upper division elective course.
   iii. The cost of UCI’s field trips seem to be higher than other UC campuses’ field trips.
   iv. Seven of 13 said they would not take the class if a course fee is charged.
   v. Need more information on why cost is so high. Has the department considered other options? FM might be the most cost effective transportation. Liability is covered by campus and FM is experienced in terms of what UCI departments need for transportation.
   vi. Why can’t students carpool? There may be liability issues.
   vii. Why is it cheaper for other campuses to go for more days?
   viii. Table vote until next week until additional information is received from ESS.

f. Management 190 – International Residential
   i. Primary concerns:
      1. Can the school manage the deficit if 30-student threshold is not met? How would this impact other students and how would it impact the school’s funding?
      2. More information on student interest?
      3. Overview
         a. Dean would like to offer more student opportunities in international education and fieldwork.
         b. Three components:
            i. Pre-trip lectures with faculty.
            ii. In-depth residential tailored to specific country; one-week onsite residential; visits to business and discussions with business executive and government officials.
            iii. Summary reporting.
      4. Student surveys: student interest update
         a. 10-15 student with very strong interest.
         b. Need to commit to 30 student participants.
         c. School will attempt to raise funding to offset costs; trying to work with Center for Global Leadership; school will commit $10,000.
         d. Estimated cost: $2,500; proposed fee: $1,500
      5. If the 30 students threshold is not met, the residential may be pushed back another year.
      6. The fee cap will be $1,500 per student; if more funding can be raised, then the cost might be lower or the school might be able to offer scholarships etc.
7. If enough students aren’t interested, there should still be enough time to cancel the residential.
8. The school will need to make decision by the end of October/early November to decide whether or not to offer the course;
9. There will be information forums, student surveys in early fall.
10. Budget breakdown: does not include airfare; students will book individually and arrange for transportation to and from airports.
11. How was this vendor chosen?
   a. Discussed the program with two vendors.
   b. The school has many years of experience with this particular vendor (used for MBA residential programs). World Strides’ package was more attractive
   c. Location/country was chosen after additional considerations for safety, health systems, transportation, etc. were taken into account.
12. Modeled after the MBA residential program.
13. Can the committee get more information on what is included in content cost ($8,000 for speaker fees, site visit costs and materials, and $9,300 for program management fee)? Content fee seems very high.
14. Can this be opened up to other non-major/minor students?
   a. Have considered this, but would like students to have some business knowledge/basic business background.
15. The committee will table vote until we have more information.
16. Other comments:
   a. Reassured that it is modeled after an existing program.
   b. Had a bidding process.
   c. With safety concerns, the organizational cost of the specific country (Japan) is understandable.
   d. Elective; students can choose to attend.

3. Student Fee Referenda – Spring 2016 Election
   a. Ballot language has been finalized; Karen will send draft language to UCOP today.
   b. ASUCI and AGS will vote on ballot language after UCOP completes review.
   c. Food Pantry referendum will be separable; can be passed solely by undergraduates, by graduate students or both. If only one student group passes the referendum, only those students will be assessed the fee.

4. Student Fee Survey Results
   a. Extremely low amount of African American respondents ~1%
   b. At least two written responses that showed some animus towards minorities.
   c. How can we get more participation by underrepresented minorities?
      i. Targeted advertising to specific multi-cultural organizations.
      ii. Sherwynn can help with advertising (flyers) to specific groups.

5. Meeting adjourned.