

Student Fee Advisory Committee

March 5, 2012

Notes to Unofficial Meeting

Present: Sandra Jones, Jason Lee, Johnson Liu, Aaron Tso, Jack Williams IV, Elaine Won, Wonsup Hwang

Absent: Patrick Le, Justin Chung, Vikram Nayudu, Lowell Trott, Chris Dunckle, Clara Schultheiss

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

- 1) Meeting called to order.
- 2) No quorum for today's meeting; AGS and ASUCI leadership in Sacramento meeting with legislators.
- 3) Minutes from February 27, 2012 regarding Anteater Express referendum and Parking's funding support will be amended as noted by Sandy Jones.
- 4) Discussion on SFAC SSF funding recommendations
 - a) Should funding be for 0.25 FTE (of the 0.50 FTE requested) for a Disability Specialist .25 FTE or \$15,000? \$15,000 was a rough estimate of half of the request. 0.25 FTE makes more sense from a payroll standpoint.
 - b) If there are additional funds from funding less than \$15K for the Disability Specialist, should additional funding be allocated to Health Education, Intercollegiate Athletics, and Campus Recreation/Club Sports?
- 5) Draft memo to EVCP regarding SSF funding available to SFAC for recommendations.
 - a) The purpose of the memo is to explain to EVCP how SFAC would like to increase allocation power; cites UC fee policy; SFAC's ability to have an impact hindered by limiting recommendations to \$100,000; and funds available to SFAC for recommendation should be proportionally tied to either incremental fee increase amounts or enrollment growth.
 - b) It should be mentioned that SFAC had to turn down many programs and units because of the lack of funding.
 - c) UCI has lowest allocation budget out of all of the campuses; CSF did a comparison (this will be attached to the memo).
 - d) Should the committee propose 5% or 10% increase?
 - e) The committee should provide any additional comments to Aaron to incorporate into the memo.

- 6) Course Materials and Services Fee Proposals.
 - a) Elaine presented the CMSF proposals submitted by Studio Arts, Drama, Biological Sciences, Physics, Education and Nursing Science. A summary of the recommendations is available to the committee on Drop Box.
 - b) Studio Arts: Mechtronic Arts course fee is essential to the course; it helps students if the department can purchase materials at a lower cost, and find more consistent materials.
 - c) Biological Sciences Lab: Proposes the same amount as other corresponding Bio Lab courses; in this case more materials are being purchase and there is 15% more class time in comparison to other labs.
 - d) Physics: requesting approval of a CMSF that is at the same level as other Physics labs; documentation needed for CMFS approval.
 - e) Drama: to cover the cost of live models used in figure drawing exercises for classes; about \$45 per student.
 - f) Education: CMSF will cover the cost of science projects; more than half of student supported; no detailed explanation provided for the type of projects.
 - g) Nursing Science: funding for simulation patient encounters and for medical supplies, linens. Most student respondents are not supportive except for noting that being able to simulate patient examinations and encounters does enhance their learning process. Other student comments include: It is not clear why some fees for some courses are high and some are lower; students would be more supportive of a flat fee; and fees seem too high in addition to increases to other tuition and fees.
 - h) Follow up questions:
 - i) Nursing: Why is the cost breakdown per students so different from course to course? Need more information about the cost per course. Can Nursing hire students for simulations or do they need professional actors?
 - ii) Education: What are some of the science projects students will be conducting and what materials would be purchased with the fees?
 - iii) Drama: Why do they need live figure models for a Drama course?
- 7) Meeting adjourned.