

## **Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) Meeting Minutes**

**Date: November 21, 2025**

**Location: BH-249**

### **1. Welcome**

Beth Lesen, Chair

- Beth provided an overview of the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) process, including the committee's role in reviewing and advising on student fee proposals.
- Committee members and guests introduced themselves.

### **2. Information Item: FY 2024-2025 Annual Fee Report**

Nathan Truong, Director, Student Financial Services

- Nathan explained that the Annual Fee Report is traditionally presented at the first meeting of the fiscal year.
- He noted that the report provides a comprehensive overview of approved student fees.
- Nathan offered to provide additional clarification or follow-up via email as needed.

### **3. Information Item: CPI Adjustment to Associated Students Fee**

Miles Nevin, Associate Vice President & Executive Director

- Andy Kerr presented background information and the historical context of the CPI adjustment.
- Miles Nevin noted that, even with the adjustment, Associated Students, Inc. (ASI) fees remain the 12th lowest in the CSU system.
- Beth Lesen commented that CSULB has a strong culture of keeping student costs low, which is commendable, but may also challenge long-term sustainability.
- Sonny Ciampa raised concerns about timing, noting that students recently experienced fee increases and that additional adjustments could result in backlash. He asked whether a compromise might be possible.
- Milton Ordonez discussed the impact of rising costs over the past three years, explaining that while cost-cutting efforts continue, sustained inflation eventually results in negative impacts.

- Beth indicated she would be happy to share committee feedback with the President.

#### 4. **Fee Requests:**

##### a. CPaCE

**Program:** Post-Master's Certificate in Instruction for Information Professionals

**Presenters:** Gracy Cole and Noah Kelly

- Gracy Cole introduced the fee request and explained that pricing was mirrored with Open University costs.
- Brian Katz asked what population the program serves and whether a similar program already exists.
- Noah Kelly clarified that this certificate is designed for post-master's students, whereas the existing teaching certificate is pre-master's.
- Gracy stated that a competitor pricing analysis was conducted and that the program remains more affordable than peer institutions.
- Brian Katz asked how students are expected to pay for the program.
- Noah noted that professional development funds are often used for similar programs and cited CSU San Bernardino as an example.

##### b. School of Art / College of the Arts (COTA) Fee Requests

The committee reviewed multiple fee proposals from the School of Art/COTA.

#### **Discussion Highlights:**

- Chris Miller (3D faculty) discussed significant increases in supply costs across vendors.
- Tanner spoke about technology needs in the sculpture program, noting that some smaller tools are no longer provided, forcing students to purchase items out of pocket. FAFSA does not cover these costs, and bulk purchasing would be more cost-effective.
- Marianne Hata emphasized that underfunding programs diminishes the student experience and noted that departments requesting fees are often doing so out of necessity and in the best interest of students.
- Brian Katz questioned whether student fees are the only viable option for supporting these programs.
- Committee members noted that the cost differences are dramatic yet cost-effective.

- Jasmine Forbes commented that several of the proposals appeared to be win-win solutions.

Additional program-specific comments:

- Brian Trimble explained that fiber faculty were unable to attend. The proposed fee supports a new course aligned with an updated and innovative curriculum, with fees consistent across the program.
- David Waldman (Cinematic Arts) stated that raising costs is a last resort. The FEA Insurance proposal represents a revision to an existing fee to improve equity. Enrollment has increased by 86% since 2019, resulting in higher operational, maintenance, and repair costs. He noted personal financial contributions made to support the department.
- Dance Fee: Intended to cover bulk-purchased conditioning materials (e.g., therabands and tension bands) for student use.
- Deborah Satterfield (Design Department) discussed inefficiencies in purchasing materials in large quantities when only small amounts are needed. Many students lack transportation, and the fee would reduce access barriers. The department has also reduced other costs, such as printing.

**FEA Insurance Discussion:**

- Asleiram Hernandez-Rodriguez asked whether students enrolled in multiple Cinematic Arts courses would be charged the fee for each class; presenters confirmed yes.
- Shelton King expressed concern about the increase from \$22 to \$96, stating he could not support the proposal.
- Brian Katz acknowledged the concern but noted that insurance is required for all students using the equipment.
- Questions were raised regarding whether the insurance covers equipment or individuals.

**Additional Comment for the Record:**

- Jasmine Forbes noted that some dance majors may already own required conditioning materials, raising concern that students could be charged for items they already possess.



**Voting Outcomes:**

- **Art Foundation 3D:** Approved unanimously (9 in favor)
- **Fiber Materials Tier II:** Approved unanimously (9 in favor)
- **FEA Insurance:** Not approved (1 in favor, 7 opposed)
- **Dance Conditioning Materials:** Approved (8 in favor, 1 opposed – Jasmine)
- **3D Printer and Laser Design Consumables:** Approved unanimously (9 in favor)
- **Design Software Fee:** Approved unanimously (10 in favor)

5. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 a.m.