

Student Fee Advisory Committee

January 29, 2021

Meeting Minutes

Present: Connor Strobel, Joseph Acevedo, Isabella Blake, Alan Doig, Darlene Esparza, Amihai Glazer, Andrew Hallak, Chico Hill, Brionna Martinez, Nisha Sandhu, Wiley Wilson

Absent: Ashkuor Abdulkader, Sarah Alkhatib, “Angel” Hsiao-Yun Tsui,

Staff: Katherine Warnke-Carpenter, Karen Mizumoto

1. Meeting called to order.
2. 1/15/21 meeting minutes approved.
3. Connor Strobel provided a Course Material Fee Review:
 - a. Focuses on something students would pay for out of pocket.
 - b. Requestors should let the committee know:
 - i. Why is it necessary?
 - ii. Is it efficient and why?
 - iii. What do students think of it?
 - iv. What do other institutions charge?
 - v. Units should not make a profit.
 - vi. The difference between this and a Fee referendum is all student would pay for something in a Fee referendum. This (Course Material Fee) is for a class and only students enrolled in this course will pay it.
 - vii. Is this course a required course?
 - viii. The estimate is on page 10. Notes indicate cost is actually \$32. They rounded up to \$35, and the committee could not approve that. If the vote were to approve this course material fee proposal, the committee would send a response back saying approval is at \$32.
 - ix. Can be covered by their financial aid package under misc. expense (40% of students at UCI would have it covered?) No requirements on return to aid for course material fees.
4. Five pillars question – is Equity Access, that Wiley Wilson brought up last year, an additional pillar we should consider on SFAC funding applications this year? Karen Mizumoto requested Wiley Wilson e-mail the language he proposed for this pillar to her and to Katherine Warnke-Carpenter for documentation.
5. Should the debrief notes get sent out to those that attended? No objections.
6. Next year’s application:

- a. Greater gap in time between the different submissions.
 - b. Surveys can be used to support the request and also just for general needs.
7. Observations of the town hall/forum by committee members:
 - a. Nice to interact.
 - b. Hard online this year since you cannot have side conversations (i.e. water cooler...which is more organic).
8. Any last minute items for discussion? None
9. Karen Mizumoto announced that three draft referenda went up to UCOP for review and they are: 1) Women's Hub (undergraduate), 2) Merage Professional (just graduate students in Merage), and 3) Esports (undergraduate).
 - a. UCOP has a lot to review (expecting 3-4 weeks turnaround and will all come in one document with suggested changes, required changes, etc.)
 - b. Question posed to the committee – should the committee review concurrently? Answer was yes.
 - c. When the proposals hit the student ballots: is it clear enough that students can understand when they vote? An example of clarification would be definitions of phrases. There will be links on the ballot for students voting. UCOP reviews for legal exposure. Three offices review (UCOP committee): General Counsel, Student Affairs, Budget Analysis and Planning.
10. Motion made and seconded for the committee members to vote on the Course Material Fee Proposal for ENGRMAE52 COMPUTER-AIDED DESIGN:
 - a. Connor Strobel-YES
 - b. Joseph Acevedo-YES
 - c. Isabella Blake-YES
 - d. Alan Doig-YES
 - e. Darlene Esparza-YES
 - f. Amihai Glazer-YES
 - g. Andrew Hallak-YES
 - h. Chico Hill-YES
 - i. Brionna Martinez-YES
 - j. Nisha Sandhu-YES
 - k. Wiley Wilson-YES
 - l. Connor Strobel voted proxy for Sarah Alkhatib-YES
11. Fee Approved.
12. No further questions.
13. Meeting adjourned.