

Student Fee Advisory Committee

April 14, 2023
Meeting Minutes

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

Absent: Sarah Semaan, Parleen Brar

Committee Staff: Karen Mizumoto and Jonathan Saucedo

- 1) Approval of 3/17/23 minutes
- 2) Discussion on Initial Rankings - Proposals
 - a) Student Affairs/ SL&L – LGBT Resource Center
 - i) Francesca wanted to rank this proposal higher but felt there were other requests that ranked higher.
 - ii) Johnathan recommended marking the request as fundable due to the amount of funding being requested.
 - iii) Request marked as fundable
 - b) Student Affairs/SL&L – Sustainability Resource Center
 - i) Francesca ranked this highly as the programming within this department is necessary and of specific interest for students.
 - ii) Request marked as maybe fundable
 - c) Student Affairs/SL&L – Cross-Cultural Center
 - i) Jun stated that he believes what this department represents was an important factor in ranking this request more highly.
 - ii) Request marked as maybe fundable
 - d) Student Affairs/WH&CS-Campus Recreations
 - i) Taeoni shared that the ARC should be accessible to all.
 - ii) Jun noted that with UCI's reputation as a commuter campus, there are many students that are not likely to use these facilities.
 - iii) Joshua added that the waiver is likely not enough to entice students to visit the ARC more, considering other costs to doing so such as parking fees.
 - iv) Jun clarified that the fee waiver is attributable to the classes offered by the ARC, not the ARC fee itself.
 - v) Professor Mehrotra recommended placing this request on the lower end of the maybe fundable category.
 - vi) Request marked as maybe fundable
 - e) School of Biological Sciences - Mathematical, Computational and Systems Biology
 - i) Professor Mehrotra believed this request to be a good motivator for students at very little cost and added that motivators like these are very common and necessary.
 - ii) Angela shared that the peer mentoring aspect is a critical component of undergraduate experiences.
 - iii) Joshua asked what student populations were served under this program, as it was approved by last year's committee.

- iv) Reginald ranked this request low as it is just an inexpensive incentive that the school could cover the cost of and added that the money would ultimately go toward an external company that would not have a significant impact on student life.
- v) Request marked as
- f) Samueli School of Engineering
 - i) Professor Mehrotra believes education in STEM fields rely heavily on peer mentoring.
 - ii) Francesca prioritized centers and programs as they have a broader scope when it comes to the student population.
 - iii) Reginald viewed this as an opportunity for the school to invest in their own students rather than the Student Fee Advisory Committee.
 - iv) Kasey shared that the school could fund this and potentially treat this as a temporary commitment rather than a permanent one.
 - v) Request categorized as maybe fundable.
- g) Division of Career Pathways
 - i) Shruti prioritized requests for student workers and felt that professional development is a critical need for many students.
 - ii) adelí believed this amount to be high and would draw down too much from the budget the committee is working with.
 - iii) Reginald would like to see information on how many students this department supported and placement rates.
 - iv) Reginald added that they would like to see students employed by this initiative rather than the department contracting this out to a vendor.
 - v) Reginald recommended marking the request as fundable but only for staff salaries.
 - vi) Request relating to student staff marked as fundable
 - vii) Request relating to photo booth marked as maybe fundable
- h) OVPTL
 - i) The request was ranked low across the board and will not be considered for funding.
- i) School of Social Ecology
 - i) Reginald believed that the request does not resolve the academic issues that students face within this school.
 - ii) Karen clarified that this process cannot consider funding requests relating to academics.
 - iii) Johnathan recommended placing this request in the not fundable category.
 - iv) Request categorized as not fundable
- j) Merage School of Business
 - i) Jun mentioned that this request is very specific to a course within the school.
 - ii) Karen does not consider this request to be academic as it is not a faculty position being requested.
 - iii) Angela supported the second priority relating to peer mentorship rather than the staff position.
 - iv) Shruti shared that she sees this as a similar program to SPOP, but more specialized to Merage School of Business.
 - v) Request relating to the full-time specialist was marked as not fundable.
 - vi) Request relating to peer advisors was marked as maybe fundable.

3) Discussion on Maybe Fundable Requests

- a) DCP – Photo Booth

- i) Reginald noted that use might be mixed amongst students, with first and second years that are certain of their career using this right away as well as third and fourth years using it as they near the end of their undergraduate experience.
 - ii) Karen to ask the unit if they would accept partial funding for the photo booth.
 - b) Johnathan will add funding scenarios to the budget request rankings worksheet in Google sheets for the committee to review for the 4/21/23 meeting.
 - c) The committee will continue to discuss funding requests and begin finalizing recommendations at the 4/21/23 meeting.
- 4) Other Business
- a) Jun will be sending out information shortly to the committee for ordering graduation stoles for SFAC members who will be graduating this year and for SFAC sweatshirts.
- 5) Meeting adjourned.