

Student Fee Advisory Committee

March 4, 2022
Meeting Minutes

Present: Andrew Hallak, Sarah Alkhatib, Chico Hill, Wiley Wilson, Anganette Cisneros, Jun Jang, Johnathan Li, Kasey Ning, Taeoni Norgaar, Nisha Sandhu, Adelí Duron, “Angel” Hsiao-Yun, Jeff Ludwig

Absent: Lee Bardwell, Elianna Elaine Martinez

Staff: Karen Mizumoto, Katherine Warnke-Carpenter

1. Meeting called to order.
2. Motion to approve the agenda. No objections. Agenda approved.
3. Motion to approve the minutes from the 2/18/2022 meeting. No objections. Minutes approved.
4. Review of Course Material Services Fees (CMSF)
 - a. The committee did not get further update/answers from Engineering on the questions returned to them.
 - b. Andrew created a summary sheet for CMSF analysis:
 - c. ENGR 7A and 7B:
 - i. Proposed increase of \$8
 - ii. Inflation
 - iii. Other schools charge similarly
 - iv. Previously paying out of NSF grant. Previous expiration date – not renewed. No additional funds now.
 - v. Textbook is used over the 2 quarters and costs \$40.
 - vi. If virtual, supplies would be mailed to the students.
 - vii. Fees not been updated for years. Staffing costs, etc. mean no extra funds.
 - viii. This course is not required. There are other options.
 - d. Is there any way to get demographics on those students that said “No”? Are these students low socio-economic status that may need financial aid? CMSF are not a part of financial aid. These are other educational costs. If they get the NSF grant again, will the fees be reduced again? Anything permanent would have to go through CSMF again. Question about why the fee was made with a temporary commitment? How will the class be impacted if this is denied? Survey was of all students who took this course. Having the students purchase directly may be a procedurally difficult.
 - e. Poll: 5 recommend fee increase, 3 do not recommend fee increase, 1 abstain
 - f. ENGR 54:
 - i. Proposed increase of \$9

- ii. Cost of the software license was cheaper during the pandemic
 - iii. Majority of students do not want the increase, but 71% found the software necessary
 - iv. No information on textbook and/or cost
 - v. If virtual, supplies would be mailed to the students
 - vi. Fees not been updated for years. Staffing costs, etc. last year SFAC did not have any requests to increase because units were trying to be mindful of costs to students.
 - vii. Not clear about individual pricing for the software
 - g. Is there support to students in STEM, where a majority of these costs seem to be? The unit does not seem to have explored all avenues to keep costs to students down.
 - h. Poll: 2 recommend fee increase, 6 do not recommend fee increase, 1 abstain
 - i. MSE 60:
 - i. Proposed increase of \$10 from \$50-60 but no backup
 - ii. The fee is used to access IMRI facilities
 - iii. 100% of students found the experiments useful in learning. 43% ok with \$60 fee and 28% ok with \$55
 - iv. No information on textbook and/or cost
 - j. If the students are fine with it considering the lack of detail, the committee feels that is ok to give \$5 increase.
 - k. Poll \$10 fee increase: 1 recommend fee increase, 6 do not recommend fee increase, 1 abstain
 - l. Poll \$5 fee increase: 7 recommend fee increase, 1 do not recommend fee increase, 0 abstain
 - m. MSE 190:
 - i. Proposed fee of \$34. Same software used throughout Engineering
 - ii. No perspective on how the students feel about the course or the added cost – no survey
 - iii. Not clear about individual pricing for the software. No information on textbook and/or cost.
 - n. Committee not pleased with lack of research and details. Definitely lacking in surveys of students.
 - o. Poll: 1 recommend fee increase, 6 do not recommend fee increase, 1 abstain
5. Committee should come up with suggestions on what more specific questions or guide would be helpful on the CSMF call, so units can answer more appropriately. Please send those to Andrew. Poll is exclusive to students taking the course currently typically.
 6. Committee will receive Budget Applications plus summary list to review and rank.
 7. Committee will meet next at the beginning of spring quarter, likely April 1, 2022
 8. No further business.
 9. Meeting adjourned.