Student Fee Advisory Committee
February 11, 2022
Meeting Minutes

Present: Andrew Hallak, Sarah Alkhatib, Lee Bardwell, Anganette Cisneros, Jun Jang, Johnathan Li, Kasey Ning, Taeoni Norgaar, Nisha Sandhu

Absent: Jeff Ludwig, Adeli Duron, Chico Hill, "Angel" Hsiao-Yun, Elianna Elaine Martinez Wiley Wilson

Staff: Katherine Warnke-Carpenter, Karen Mizumoto

1. Meeting called to order.

2. Motion to approve the agenda. No objections. Agenda approved.

3. Motion to approve the minutes from the 11/19/2021 meeting. No objections. Minutes approved.

4. Welcome back from winter break.

5. Budget Applications are due February 25, 2022.

6. Review of Course Material Services Fees (CMSF)

   a. Is an additional fee tied to some courses that covers misc. costs not provided in ongoing budget? Associated with: software, field trips, lab materials, etc.
   b. Units submit applications to Budget Office: cost analysis, historical context, and student feedback. SFAC then reviews and provides feedback to the Provost, but it is up to him to approve or deny.
   c. Want departments to understand the need of the fee.
   d. To consider: can the department use other funds, why do they need to charge, what do similar campuses do, what do the students taking the class think, is it a skillset the student needs for their occupational trajectory?
   e. HSSoE - ENGR 7A/7B, $8 increase from $53 to $61 per quarter ($122 for the 7A/B sequence). For consumable parts for lab (to build a rover), required skillset for students on the career path.
      i. There is another course (a senior design course) that has a CMSF of $160 and there is another course with a $134 CMSF.
      ii. Majority of students surveyed do not favor an increase (56% did not feel the increase was reasonable; 40% said they felt it was reasonable).
      iii. Comparatives are fees that cover the whole program not just a similar class, so this is not as directly comparable.

    iv. Majority of students feel the fee increase is too much. 15%. Inflation is less than this. There has been no increase on this fee since established however.

    v. Other funding in the Unit is not sustainable. Running a deficit every year and carryforward will run out. What are other ways to fund?

    vi. Student committee member is in HSSoE supported the importance of this class and the fact it has not increased for a while. This is a tech elective and not required. They can take 14 other tech electives. Student fees should be the last resort, especially increases. Faculty committee member indicated some tech components are exceeding the general rate of inflation. The cost of a book might be just as costly. Was/Is this class held online? Materials would typically still be shipped to the students enrolled

    vii. Karen Mizumoto to follow-up with the Unit with these supplemental questions. Tabled for answers to follow-up questions from the Unit.

f. HSSoE - ENGR 54 - from $25 to $34 ($9 increase) for software costs.

    i. 71% of students felt it was necessary but did not like the increase.

    ii. Software was cheaper during the pandemic but has since increased.

    iii. Have they exhausted other avenues to cover the change in price?

g. HSSoE - MSE 60 - Increase fee from $50 to $60.

    i. Covers access to facility needed for course projects.

    ii. Running deficit covered by department, but not sustainable going forward.

    iii. Students felt the experiences in the course was useful for their learning experience.

    iv. 43% of students were willing to pay $60 ($10 increase)---largest slice of pie; 28% okay with a $55 fee ($5 increase); $29% of students said no increase.

    v. Would they consider a $5 increase instead of the $10 increase as an alternative option? It does not seem so. They were only inquiring what fee increase were reasonable to students. It seems like the proposal indicated a $10 increase was needed.

    vi. Deficits have been covered by department, but they are unable to do so going forward.

    vii. Given students responded that the equipment usage was important, the fee increase is reasonable

    viii. Show why the increase in costs cannot be covered by the department instead of passing on the increase to students.

    ix. Follow-up questions:

        1. Given student feedback would they consider a lower fee? Would they consider a $5 increase instead of the $10 increase as an alternative option? If a $5 fee increase would not be an option, why not?

        2. Why can't they cover the cost with other funds? How exhaustive was the search for other fund sources rather than passing on the cost to students?

        3. Textbook or other costs in addition to the CMSF?

     h. No action needed on HSSoE - MSE160L. Clerical correction to move fee from the lecture to the lab.

     i. HSSoE - MSE 190

         i. New fee to support the cost of software for the course.

         ii. Tested for the last two years and department determined this was the correct software for the course.

         iii. Students can use software for other classes.

         iv. $34 CMSF.

         v. New fee did not provide student feedback.

         vi. How long would the software be available? For the term or permanent?

         vii. Did they exhaust approaches to partner with the company? Is it cheaper through the course fee or for students purchasing the fee outside of the CMSF?

         viii. Would be possible to get student feedback? If the course is not currently being taught, it would be difficult to get student feedback or a meaningful response rate in a week. The committee can mention the need for student feedback in the recommendations.

         ix. Is this the only cost for the course, or are students also purchasing textbooks?

         x. Follow-up questions:

             1. How long would the software be available to the students?

             2. Is it cheaper for the students to pay for the software through the course fee or for the students to purchase it directly?

             3. Have they exhausted all other fund sources to pay for the software?

             4. Student feedback? [Include in recommendations to Provost that the department needs to try to get student feedback regardless of whether the course is currently being offered rather than a specific question.]

             5. Are there textbooks as well that students are being asked to purchase for these courses?

7. Karen will send follow-up questions to the SoE and will ask for responses by next Friday so the committee can continue discussing the proposals.

8. SFAC Forum Debrief

     a. Andrew introduced himself and gave overview of the committee and what committee was looking for in terms of budget considerations.

     b. There were over 20 participants.

     c. One additional theme the committee will keep in mind while going through the proposals/applications (in March/early April) is what student needs are as they are transitioning back to campus from remote instruction.

     d. The committee was asked some logistical questions: Are we eligible to apply? How does the department deal with the uncertainties of COVID? What should be done in terms of if events go virtual?

     e. The departments should provide us with as much info as possible. Provide a budget for in-person events. Also, provide additional information for what course of action will be taken in case event does go virtual.

9. Proposed Student Referenda Language
    a. Karen will send the committee the three proposed student referenda via email for review.
    b. Look at the referendum language from the student perspective. Does it make sense? Is it clear? Is there any clarification that is necessary for the student body to understand what the referendum is?
    c. Get back with comments by EOB on Wednesday, 2/16.

10. No further questions.

11. Meeting adjourned.