

CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

August 25, 2010

MINUTES**ATTENDEES**

Members:	David Ely	Grant Mack
	Amanda Pascoe	Sean Kashanchi
	Candice Luistro	Laura Schofield
	Ethan Singer	Eric Rivera
	Kimberlee Reilly	Cathie Atkins
Student Alternates:	Kevin Gruidl	
Guests:	Scott Burns	Marti Ruel, AVP Student Services
	Maria Hanger, Interim Director, Health Promotion	Sandy Jorgensen-Funk
	Tom Wilson, Director SHS	

The meeting was called to order at 12:00 P.M. by Dr. David Ely, CFAC Chair.

Approval of August 6, 2010 CFAC Meeting Minutes (Attachment 1)

The minutes were reviewed later in the meeting. Mr. Mack made a motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded by Mr. Gruidl. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Informational Items

- a. Sub-Committee Report on Alternative Consultation
 - i. Draft of SHS Alternative Consultation Proposal (Attachment A)

The subcommittee (Grant, Amanda, Candice, Cathie, Eric and David) presented this draft, but there was additional information coming from Student Health Services (SHS) regarding how to proceed with soliciting student input.

Ms. Ruel reported that Dr. Kitchen and President Weber had a follow up discussion several days after last CFAC meeting. The Division of Student Affairs has asked that an alternative consultation process be used rather than a referendum to gather input from students. Ms Ruel reported that Dr. Weber is willing to permit alternative consultation but first wants to know how students feel about using alternative consultation to gather feedback on the Student Health Services fee increase before making a final decision.

Dr. Ely referred to attachment A. With the last alternative consultation, there were a lot of presentations to student organizations, college councils and Associated Students (AS); there were also a few open forums. One of the criticisms from last time alternative consultation used was that some students who were not involved with student government or student organizations felt left out, even though there were some open forums.

The CFAC subcommittee wanted to propose a process that would reflect student views of the full student body; they recommend a process based on random sampling. Students would be randomly selected and invited to these presentations to be informed about the proposal and get a chance to reflect, provide input and vote about this proposal. One of the advantages of random sampling over the alternative consultation process used in the past and referenda is that inferences can be made about the entire student body (Dr. Ely).

Dr. Ely explained that with random sampling, more than 385 students would need to be invited to these presentations to ensure a desired attendance of 385. There could be 8 sessions with 50 students each; this would be an appropriate size to allow students to ask questions. The presentation must be neutral and should take 30 minutes, which would include a 15 minute presentation by SHS. The SHS presentation would be followed by student participation. At the end of the process feedback would be collected from students and the outcome would be sent to the AS elections committee and then to the AS Council to certify the results.

There are still some areas of concern:

- Show rate
- If a small percentage of the invited students choose to participate, the students in the sample would be self selected rather than randomly selected.
- If participation incentives were offered, a bias could be introduced as the more price sensitive students would be more likely to agree to participate

Dr. Ely referred to the ballot on the back of attachment A, which asks participants to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with the proposal. The ballot also asks for written comments regarding the proposal.

Mr. Burns asked about self selection bias in a referendum and how it is different from the bias in alternative consultation. Dr. Ely responded that there is bias in a referendum, but not enough is known about the voting students to calculate the extent of the bias. The difference is that in a referendum there would be a lot more students than in alternative consultation, so the bias should be a little less severe in a referendum. It also takes less time to go online and vote in a referendum, versus at least half an hour with the alternative consultation process the subcommittee proposes.

Dr. Ely outlined some guidelines for presentations to the students:

- ✓ Neutral person with background to give accurate presentation
- ✓ Present to CFAC first to ensure neutral presentation
- ✓ Invite knowledgeable individuals to provide pro/con statements

CFAC's recommendation will go to Dr. Weber. If CFAC recommends alternative consultation, President Weber still has to approve it (Dr. Singer).

Mr. Kashanchi asked if the information and presentation can be sent to all students along with a quick survey – this would mean a referendum (Dr. Ely).

Mr. Mack commented that this alternative consultation is better than what happened two years ago, but it's not clear that it's better than a referendum and asked why the committee is choosing one method over another. He is hoping to discuss the outcome the committee is looking for and what is the best process to inform the students.

Mr. Burns stated that the Executive Order is clear in that alternative consultation can be used if it determined to be the most meaningful way of gauging student opinion. Is the process of informing people through a process based on random selection and bias elimination more meaningful than a referendum? At the end of the day it is up to the president to determine that alternative consultation is the most meaningful way of gauging student support based on the advice of this committee.

Ms. Ruel expressed concern over the time limit for the presentation, since they have not been able to keep previous presentations to 30 minutes. SHS wants students to understand the ramifications of a vote against the fee. Understanding the services students will no longer have access to takes more than a 15 minute conversation. Trying to put this in an email would take several pages, which is a concern in a referendum, where students may not access the fact that they will lose all these services if the fee doesn't pass. 30 minutes is almost an impossible time limit. SHS would need 45 minutes for the jest of presentations. 15 minutes for questions and answers is not enough either (Mr. Wilson). Dr. Ely warned about the tradeoff; the longer the presentation, the fewer students will tend to show. Ms. Ruel suggested distributing Q&A sheets to cut time and get straight to specialty questions. Mr. Burns asked that the presentation get to student issues right away; the length of the presentation depends on the audience as well.

i. Draft of SHS Referendum Public Notice (Attachment B)

This draft was presented by the subcommittee in case it was the method of choice by the majority. The dates in the first paragraph need to match the dates above "Polling Hours": October 26-27, 2010. The ballot language is standard with a general description of the proposal, what a yes or no vote means, and the financial analysis.

Dr. Singer asked about the calculation of the \$2.3 million deficit. Mr. Wilson explained that this is based on projections for the current year and the use of reserves. There have been substantial cuts and \$2.3 million is as low as it can get. Enrollment has gone down substantially, while expenses have gone up. Mr. Burns has seen the prior year deficits approaching this amount. In Mr. Burns' opinion, the projected enrollment is very optimistic and with the assumption that budgets will be restored.

Ms. Reilly asked if students would be able to see the Summary of Ballot Issue with alternative consultation; this may be helpful. It could be included at the will of the committee (Mr. Rainer). This can also be included in the email invitation to students (Dr. Ely).

Regarding the incentives to participate in the alternative consultation process, Mr. Burns listed some concerns:

- How to pay for it?
- Is it appropriate?
- Does it introduce bias?

The CFAC subcommittee discussed the bias issue with a statistician. The advantage is that an incentive would bring people beyond those who, are either extremely favorable or extremely opposed, so it is possible to construct a random sample. An incentive could introduce a bias by drawing price sensitive people and if SHS were to provide the incentive it may cause a student to feel more inclined to support Health Services. Ms. Luistro disagrees that an incentive will steer students one way or another; if students don't want a fee they will voice their opinion, especially since their feedback will be anonymous. Mr. Mack cautioned about the student perception regarding the incentive, since SHS is asking to raise fees, yet using money towards incentives. Another concern is that some students might question why they were not chosen to participate over others and why everyone else is not part of the process.

Ms. Ruel asked if this would preclude them from inviting students to attend open forums. This would be for education only; how would open forum feedback be used along with the data from the true random samples? (Mr. Rainer) Ms. Ruel would like as many voices included in these sessions; the open forum feedback can be kept separate from the random samples, but still presented to the president. Dr. Singer doesn't see a problem with having the random sample feedback and feedback from everyone else, but the committee has to agree on this.

Ms. Ruel would also like to include parents in this process. This would be two sided because of the parents' insurance (Dr. Singer). Health Services not only provides the service, but also confidentiality for the students (Mr. Rivera).

Why not go to a referendum where there is a systematic way of gathering input from anyone who wants to participate in the process? The advantage and justification for alternative consultation relies on random sampling (Dr. Ely).

Mr. Mack raised an issue with the referendum: when it comes to a student vote, students think very short term; the student is voting on benefits now. The subcommittee has come with a better process for alternative consultation. The committee still needs to clarify what types of fees to use alternative consultation or referendum for. Regarding short term versus long term fees, Ms. Reilly noted that if students vote against the SHS fee right now, their services will be removed right away, so the referendum concern might not be as big a factor in this case.

b. Draft Fall Referendum Calendar (Attachment C)

Dr. Hanger asked about an alternative consultation calendar. With a referendum there are very specific dates that must be met to reach a successful conclusion. With alternative consultation the end date still has to be the same, but there are no required benchmarks in between (Dr. Ely).

The following documents were also presented at this meeting:

- c. Draft Referendum Announcement for Daily Aztec (Attachment D)
- d. SHS Proposed Financial Justification (Attachment E)
- e. Comparison of Hospital Fee vs. SHS Fees (Attachment F)

Action Item

- a. Should CFAC recommend to the President to use Alternative Consultation or the Referendum process to determine students' support of the proposed SHS Fee?

Dr. Singer moved to recommend approval of alternative consultation for this fee proposal; the motion was seconded by Mr. Kashanchi.

This process will need more oversight and collaboration with SHS; specifics need to be worked out thoroughly. Mr. Mack also foresees a lot of political backlash; all students are going to see is a fee.

Mr. Kashanchi likes the idea of open forums with discussion, done before random sampling. Mr. Kashanchi made the motion to amend the motion to incorporate open forums prior to the selection of a random sample and to have CFAC develop a timeline before any other steps are taken. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mack.

Ms. Reilly asked if students participating in open forums could get the false impression that they will be part of the decision-making process. This should not be a problem, since the president will still make the final decision (Mr. Rivera).

Dr. Singer made a motion to amend the amended motion for open forums to also be conducted separate from random sampling and that CFAC discuss at the next meeting the timing of those versus the random sample sessions. Mr. Kashanchi and Mr. Mack agreed. Dr. Ely asked if this amendment includes collecting data from the open forums. Discussion followed. Data should be collected from open forums as well, but it should be taken as a piece of the information and then do the random sampling as a more accurate way of gauging general student opinion. Random sampling is a better representation of the entire student body (Mr. Mack).

The motion on the floor is to amend the original motion to use alternative consultation but to incorporate open forums as a complement to random sampling and to develop a timeline. All committee members voted in favor of amending the motion. The motion was amended unanimously.

The committee moved on to the original motion of adopting alternative consultation, which will now include a recommendation to the president to include both random sampling techniques and open forums. The committee voted in favor of alternative consultation, with no abstentions and no objections. The motion passed unanimously.

There will be eight sessions with students selected through the random sampling process; Mr. Burns suggested these to happen every night for two weeks. CFACs recommendation needs to go to the president by the end of October. The committee will work with Enrollment Services to randomly select Red IDs for the random sample.

Mr. Mack made the motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Mr. Gruidl. The meeting adjourned at 12:57 PM.

Reminder: Next Meeting Date – please note different date and place - Tuesday, September 14, 2010 at 2:00 p.m. in the **Student Affairs large conference room, SSW 2640**