

Student Fee Advisory Committee

March 6, 2013
Meeting Minutes

Present: Robert Gomez, Meerae Park, Myron Lozano, Justin Chung, Elizabeth Pace, Patrice Kiiru, Traci Ishigo

Absent: Vishal Patel, Jason Lee, Melody Wang, Andrea Gaspar, Naaz Mirreghabie

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

- 1) Meeting called to order.
- 2) Meeting minutes from February 20, 2013 and February 27, 2013 meeting approved.
- 3) SOAR Referendum
 - a) Staff and Student Representatives presented the SOAR (Student Outreach and Retention Center) referendum ballot language to the committee for review and approval.
 - b) The proposed fee will fund the SOAR operations, currently funded by temporary funds. There have been proposed funding referenda in the past, but none have met the student quorum criteria for compulsory campus-based fees.
 - c) The SOAR Center was started as a result of student interest in creating a “one-stop” hub or bridge for undergraduate students to get information on campus resources and services that provide a pathway for success at UCI. SOAR also provides space for students to study, network and engage, and to work on student initiated activities supported by SOAR funds.
 - d) The quarterly fee \$4.50, if passed, would be assessed to all undergraduate students beginning in fall 2014 after the temporary funding ends. 33%, or \$1.48 of the quarterly fee, would be applied to return-to-aid; the remaining \$3.02 would be used for operating costs of the SOAR Center. Starting in fall 2015, the fee will be adjusted annually based on the California Consumer Price Index rate for urban consumers.
- 4) Committee discussion on SOAR Referendum
 - a) Given the short turnaround time, the committee will, in general, support the fee significant with reservations.
 - b) Justin will respond to Graciela Fernandez and include the following concerns:
 - i) The absence of a sunset clause or language for a future re-vote.
 - ii) No provision for review of annual budget and financial reports by ASUCI.
 - iii) The inclusion of an annual automatic increase without student oversight; this would be the first time a campus-based fee included an automatic increase. Due to the short

- time frame for committee approval of the ballot language, the committee will approve the language as is, but in the future, the committee will be unlikely to approve of any proposed ballots which include this language.
- iv) Concern that campus administration seems to be advocating or campaigning for a proposed student fee referendum (see CSF Standing Policy #7).
- 5) SFAC Student Referendum Review Process
- a) The committee would like to be involved earlier in the process in order to provide comments/suggested revisions to the ballot language.
 - b) Myron will work on gathering all of the individual referendum policies and processes housed in different campus departments; the point(s) of contact will need to be identified (maybe Sandy Jones can be a starting point) and begin developing guidelines to include SFAC in the student referenda procedures.
- 6) Student Survey
- a) Marguerite would like to meet with Naaz to discuss survey again, but the committee is not sure if this is necessary at this point.
 - b) The pilot will need to be run in the next few weeks in order to keep on schedule to launch the survey in the first week of the spring quarter.
 - c) Naaz will need to update the survey one more time (Karen will provide Naaz with the list of changes):
 - i) Transportation Survey currently developed and launched; good survey with better information. Data has been with shared Anteater Express and Traci will check with Ryan to see if the data is available. Questions 25 & 26 can be taken out if transportation data is available.
 - ii) Get rid of notes in page one and change time to complete survey to 15 minutes.
 - iii) Page 6 is extraneous (no content).
 - iv) First statement in question 5 needs to be changed; SFAC will not be making mental health funding decisions.
 - v) Page 9: Need picture of Student Center.
 - vi) Need more description on what the Bren Center Fee is for.
 - vii) Need picture of ARC and more description.
 - viii) Need more description on TGIF (add link to TGIF website?).
 - ix) Need more description on Campus Spirit Fee and pictures of athletics events?
 - x) Pictures for all referenda.
- 7) 2013-14 Course Materials and Services Fee Proposals
- a) Engineering 98/7A, 7B:
 - i) The majority of students do not agree that the proposed \$75 fee is reasonable, and seem to be opposed to the fee at the current level.

- ii) Lab support staff should be standard for a lab and should not be considered “specialized instruction”; the committee believes the fee should be decreased by amount for lab support staff.
 - iii) If the EVCP does not support this recommendation, then fee level should be reduced to an amount that students agree are reasonable.
- b) MAE Courses:
- i) Students not happy about fees.
 - ii) Survey provided for MAE 60, but the committee would like to see surveys for other courses (MAE 107, MAE 150L, MAE 189 I, II, III—both Racecar and Electric Racecar sections).
 - iii) The institutional cost of running the lab should not be included in a CMSF; it is a stretch to say Engineering labs have specialized operating procedures; should be part of core instruction costs.
 - iv) The CMSFs be reduced to cost of materials and not cover instruction costs.
 - v) Could some of the instruction be provided by TAs? Are TAs being used?
- c) ChEMS Courses:
- i) Same concerns about CMSFs supporting lab managers/senior development engineers.
 - ii) Need student feedback on proposed fees.
- d) Biological Sciences Courses:
- i) Students are not supportive of the proposed fees; more detailed information on student feedback is needed.
 - ii) There is too sharp of an increase for the virology lab; Biological Sciences should phase in the fee over more than one year (i.e., limit increases to \$25.00 per year). The course has combined two previous courses, each with a \$75.00 CMSF. The CMSFs have not been increases since they were first approved (2004-05).
 - iii) Other Biological Sciences CMSFs increases seem more moderate.
 - iv) The Biological Sciences CMSFs only recover costs for materials and supplies (no labor).
- e) General SFAC view: the committee should not endorse any CMSF that does not have student input and also should not support any CMSF that includes payroll costs for lab managers/lab technicians or other support staff.
- f) The committee will not endorse the CMSF proposals before additional information, as noted (student feedback), is provided by the departments.
- g) Justin would like the committee to review the CMSF proposals (all on Drop Box) to note any other concerns.
- h) Justin will draft a reply to the EVCP on the proposed CMSFs once the committee’s review has been completed.
- 8) Meeting adjourned.