Student Fee Advisory Committee
January 20, 2023
Meeting Minutes

Present: Jun Jang, Johnathan Li, Parleen Brar, Francesca Fong, Reginald Gardner, Taeoni Norgaar, Angela Yun, adelí Duron, Lee Bardwell, Sharad Mehrotra, Kasey Ning

Absent: Shruti Gundu, Joshua Ma

Committee Staff: Karen Mizumoto and Patti Cooper

1) Approval of 12/8/22 minutes

2) Jun provided a recap of 1/13/23 SFAC Forum & Q&A
   a) The amount of the 2022-23 unallocated SSF funds that will be rolled over to the 2023-24 cycle is $26,798, so there will be a total of $276,798 available for the committee to provide budget recommendations to the Provost.
   b) Distribution process
      i) After the committee has finished the budget deliberations, recommendations to the Provost will be included in the year-end annual report.
      ii) Karen explained that the Provost will then ask a group of his advisors to review the recommendations and provide feedback to him before the recommendations are approved. Once the recommendations are approved, the recommendations go into the Budget Office's Budget File database and the Budget Office will process the allocations. In the past, the SFAC budget allocation process was separate from the large campus budget allocation process, and the goal was for the SFAC budget recommendations to be allocated by the July 1, adjusted budget. However, now that it is part of the campus budget process, it takes places later in the fall quarter at the earliest. The Budget Office portfolio managers for each campus control point will allocate the funds and then after that, the control points will need to allocate the funds to the individual units.
      iii) Control points will be notified of approved recommendations in a memo from the Provost.
      iv) Units requesting funds should contact their control points to see if they were included in the approvals.
   c) Karen clarified that some of the Q&As were not word for word. Some of the Q&As were edited for clarity and some additional detail was added to the answers.
      i) Specifically, in regard to adelí's question about funding cuts to student positions in Student Affairs that are not 100% confirmed for 2023-24, units may make budget requests through SFAC to backfill budget cuts. However, if the budget cuts do not actually happen, Student Affairs needs to notify the committee, and if the committee does not agree with how the funds might be repurposed, they might request that the funds be returned.
   d) There was a follow up discussion regarding a chat question Student Affairs had regarding technology funding and making a request through the ETIAC (committee that discusses eTech fee).

     i)   The Campus Groups platform purchased by OIT marketed to campus groups, but OIT is now pushing down the cost to Student Affairs

     ii) It used by multiple departments across the campus. Campus Orgs is dependent on the platform will need funds for the licenses and other costs associated with supporting the platform.

     iii) Karen indicated that since eTech funds are specific to technology for instruction and coursework, any costs not related to this should not be supported by eTech fee funds. The co-curricular student services and activities supported by the platform could be funded by SSF funds. Depending on the scope and size of the funding needs, a request could be made through SFAC, but if it is a large project, then it may be more appropriate that the budget request be made through other means, although there will not be a campus budget call for 2023-24. Student Affairs and/or OIT may have requested funds for the 2022-23 campus budget call, but it was not a high priority request and was not funded. If other campus administrative units are utilizing the platform for non-co-curricular student services/activities outside of what SSF funds should support, then Student Affairs might consider recharging campus departments for the use of the platform. This may require higher-level campus discussions.

     iv) Adeli provided a link to the additional information on Campus Groups: campusgroups.uci.edu

     v) As a sidenote, Jun mentioned ETIAC (the campus committee that oversees the eTech fee) is looking for an SFAC representative. Because the eTech fee is mostly an undergraduate fee (charged based on undergraduate lecture course unit taken, up to 15 units per quarter), it would be more appropriate for an undergraduate student to be the SFAC representative. If no other members can serve, Jun will continue to serve.

3) Update on the unit operating reports/budget requests and proposed student referenda.

   a) Karen provide updates on operating reports/budget requests and proposed student referenda for the 2023 spring elections.

   b) Operating reports are due to the committee on 1/27/23 and three reports have been submitted so far. Most of the reports will be submitted sometime on 1/27 or over the next few days after that. [Update: there has been some turnover in several of the academic units (the Budget Office was not informed of the staff changes) and the email call for operating reports was not forwarded to the new staff, so there may be a few reports that may be submitted later.]

   c) No budget requests have been submitted yet.

   d) There is one proposed student fee referendum for the ARC expansion project. The draft referendum was forwarded to UCOP prior to the winter break. UCOP is currently reviewing the language and will provide feedback either next week or early the following week. UCOP is also reviewing all fee referenda language for all of the campuses, not just UCI, and because this will be a facility fee used to repay the debt on the expansion project, it will take longer to review.

     i)   The SFAC will need to review the language and provide suggested revisions by February 3, 2023 in order for the proposed referendum to be forwarded to AGS and ASUCI for their approval of the ballot language Any suggested revisions from the committee needs to be considered so it does not alter what UCOP legal counsel has already reviewed in order to not create any potential legal exposure for the campus.

     ii) This project is an extension/expansion of the current ARC facility.

4) Overview of CMSF proposals.
   a) Jun briefly summarized the two CMSF proposals that have been submitted. The proposals will be reviewed over the next couple of meetings and a vote will take for the recommendations that will be submitted to the Provost. These are recommendations; the Provost will take into consideration, but the Provost will make the ultimate decision.
   b) Committee members should review the proposals and be prepared to begin discussing them at the 1/27/23 meeting.
   c) Two CMSF proposals were submitted: One from Biological Sciences for Bio 93L/94L and one from Physical Sciences-Earth System Sciences for ESS 226
      i) Bio 93L/94L:
         (1) This is a dry lab course for an intro to Bio lab.
         (2) A $25.00 per student (approximately 1,500 headcount enrollments) CMSF undergraduate students enrolled in Bio 93L
         (3) This is a one-time fee when students enroll in Bio 93L, but some of the fee would cover costs for Bio 94L (costs for Bio 94L are much less than for Bio 93L).
         (4) These are intro Bio courses taken over two quarter. Almost all students taking Bio 93L will take Bio 94L.
         (5) Bio Sciences would consider splitting the fee between the two courses.
         (6) The expected revenue = $35k.
         (7) Student consultations were conducted with students currently enrolled in Bio 93; comments from student consultations included at the end of the proposal.
         (8) Karen will follow up with Bio to find out how many student who take Bio 93L also take Bio 94L. What is the retention rate for Bio 94L? Of the 1,500 headcount enrollment, what is the split between the two courses?
      ii) ESS (Earth System Sciences) 226
         (1) This is a graduate-level course.
         (2) The $160 per student CMSF fee will offset cost for field trip and transportation costs.
         (3) The course is open to non-ESS students
         (4) Statistics for students responding included in the survey response.
         (5) Karen will follow up with Physical Sciences ESS to find out if the field trips optional or required for the course.

5) Jun provided an update on committee membership
   a) ASUCI President Sarah Semaan will serve as the interim ASUCI representative. Jun will forward documents and information to Sarah.
   b) Jun working to fill the open at-large undergraduate representative vacancy.
   c) The Provost will not need to approve interim representatives, but nominees for permanent (for the term) representatives will need to be approved by the Provost.

6) Meeting adjourned.