

# Student Fee Advisory Committee

January 27, 2023

Meeting Minutes (revised)

Present: Jun Jang, Johnathan Li, Francesca Fong, Reginald Gardner, Taeoni Norgaar, adeli Duron, Sharad Mehrotra, Kasey Ning, Shruti Gundu, Reginald Gardner, Joshua Ma, Angela Yun, Parleen Brar

Absent: Sarah Semaan, Lee Bardwell

[Edit: Correction to the spelling of Sarah's last name from Seeman to Semaan and to change Parleen Brar to from absent to present]

Committee Staff: Karen Mizumoto and Jonathan Saucedo

1) Approval of 1/20/23 minutes.

2) CMSF Proposals

a) BIO 93 and BIO 94 – Intro to Bio Dry Labs

i) Johnathan recommends that the fee should be separated into \$20 for BIO 93 and \$5 for BIO 94.

(1) Bio Sci provided additional enrollment data that there are approximately 5-10% of students who take 93L will not enroll in 94L

ii) Most of the students surveyed support the fee.

iii) Professor Mehrotra asked why the fee was combined for two courses. Karen clarified that the fees for both courses were combined because it reduces the administrative work and most of the fee contributes to BIO 93.

iv) Reginald asked if students are allowed to take a year off in between courses and will not be charged again when enrolling in BIO 94. Karen confirmed that students enrolling in BIO 94 will not be charged the \$25 fee a second time.

v) Reginald moves to create two votes, one to approve the fee and the other to split the fee for each course.

vi) Vote to approve fee: 7 recommend, 0 oppose, 0 abstain

(1) Motion passes

vii) Vote to split the fee: 6 recommend, 1 oppose, 0 abstain

(1) Motion passes

b) ESS 226 – Grad Level Course

i) CMSF supports the field trip that is part of the course.

ii) Reginald asked if the fee is optional for students who are participating in the field trip. Karen answered confirmed with Physical Sciences that this will be an optional fee and that students would either be refunded the fee or the department will wait to charge the fee later in the quarter.

iii) Jun clarified that the fee level is what the committee is voting on, not the matter of the fee being optional.

iv) Karen stated that language sent for Provost's approval will mention the fee being optional.

v) Vote: 7 recommend, 0 oppose, 0 abstain

(1) Motion passes

- 3) Campus-Based Fee Referendum
  - a) Karen provided an update on the ARC referendum.
  - b) UCOP has reviewed the language and provided feedback. Student Affairs and the referendum sponsor are making a couple of changes for clarification. And should be ready to be reviewed by the committee next week (2/3/23 SFAC meeting).
  - c) The committee's recommendations need to be provided no later than 2/10/23 in order to forward the referendum to the AGS/ASUCI student governments.
  - d) Karen advised the committee needs to be careful not to alter the language such that there may legal issues with UC General Counsel who has already reviewed the language and we do not want to create any legal liabilities for the campus.
  - e) Jun reminded the committee of the charge to review the referendum language and to make sure the referendum is easy for students to understand and read. From there AGS/ASUCI will be voting on the merits of the referendum and whether the referendum should be put on the spring. Stephanie Van Ginkel (Executive Director, Student Government) has advised that the hard deadline for the referendum to be presented to the respective councils in week 8, so the SFAC review will need to be completed before 2/14/23 when AGS meets.
  
- 4) Operating Reports and Budget Requests
  - a) Karen provided an update on the operating reports and budget requests submissions. So far, six or seven operating reports have been received (no budget requests yet). The bulk of the submissions will be submitted over the next few days.
  - b) Professor Mehrotra asked how many funding requests were received last year. adeli recalled there were about 14 submissions and 11 were funded, although there were layers to the requests, so some submissions had multiple requests. In the past, there have been over 30. It is likely there will be more this year based on the forum discussion and the budget situation.
  - c) Depending on the number of submissions, the committee can decide whether or not to break into subcommittees to review the proposals and who will be assigned to each subcommittee.
  - d) Professor Mehrotra asked for what kind of input the committee was looking for from non-voting faculty and staff members. Jun responded in past years and what the committee will probably do this year, is that the faculty and staff representatives reviewed and completed initial rankings of the proposals based on their own individual preferences, experiences, fields, backgrounds and during the deliberations they provided additional insight and information from the administrative standpoint for things the students may not be aware of.
  - e) Professor Mehrotra also asked if diversity a criteria in terms of evaluating requests for hiring students. During the initial ranking, it would be up to the individual members to include diversity as a consideration, but during the discussions, the faculty and staff perspectives on this can be brought up because students do not typically sit in on hiring decisions. [Note from Karen: diversity cannot be used in terms of a qualification for hiring UC employees, but the pools of applicants for positions need to be from diverse populations.]
  
- 5) Meeting adjourned.