

# CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 26, 2008

## MINUTES

### ATTENDEES

|                     |   |  |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Members:            | Kimberley Reilly<br>Daniel Osztreicher<br>Joyce Byun<br>Ethan Singer<br>David Ely | Joy Salvatin<br>Grant Garske<br>Ignacio Prado<br>Valerie Renegar<br>Julie Messer |
| Student Alternates: | Brian Talton  |  |
| Non-Voting Member:  | Ray Rainer  |  |
| Others/Guests:      | Scott Burns<br>Chuck Lang   | Dan Cornthwaite<br>Daniel Simaen   |

The meeting was called to order at 2:04 p.m. by Ms. Kimberley Reilly, CFAC Committee Chair. Introductions were made.

### Informational Items

#### a. CFAC Calendar and Member Roster (Attachment 1)

The committee reviewed the CFAC Calendar and Member Roster. All corrections or additions should be notified to Ray Rainer.

#### b. SDSU 2007/2008 Campus Fee Report (Attachment 2)

Ms. Reilly addressed the campus fee report and went over its structure; the fee categories are in the first column. Some of the fees are for the year; they include 2 semesters worth of fees. Any questions regarding this report can be directed to Ms. Reilly or Mr. Rainer.

### Fee Requests

#### a. Proposed IRA Fee Increase

Scott Burns introduced the proposal to seek an IRA Fee increase via alternative consultation. One of the listed purposes of this fee is to support intercollegiate athletics, and certain activities such as theater and musical performances. Some important points to be considered are:

- CSU Executive Order 1034 now gives campus presidents the authority to adjust and recommend adjustments to category II fees.
- IRA fees are category II (mandatory to enroll and attend the university).
- Per EO 1034, these fees may be established or increased via a student fee referendum vote or alternative consultation.
- The current IRA fee is \$95/semester, the first \$15 is used for Sports Clubs, music licensing fees, insurance and overhead expenses, and \$80 is evenly split between Academic Affairs and Athletics with a portion allocated to sports clubs and mandatory fees.
- The IRA fee is to sustain a viable and competitive division 1-A athletic program, which is a part of our history, image, and tradition – critical for outreach, alumni support and university relations and development.
- Gender equity and requirements under CAL-NOW call for the need to add women sports, which in turn need grants.
- Grants-in-aid/scholarships need to be proportional to the percentages in gender at the university.
- Rising costs of grants-in-aid, which in the last 7 years have gone from \$2.7 million to \$5.4 million a year.
- Reliance on one time funding is no longer sustainable.

The Athletics program at SDSU currently ranks 12 among CSU (23 campuses), which is below the mean. Within the conference we rank 5<sup>th</sup> out of 9; with this fee increase we would protect our ranking within the conference. There are plans to add two women sports, possibly Lacrosse and Sand Volleyball. Grant-in-aid costs are factored into the pro forma of the proposed new fee; the grant-in-aid cost directly related to the addition of women's sports is \$400,000-\$500,000. There are other expenses such as coaching and travel.

The proposed IRA increase is \$80.00 per semester; \$73.00 would go to Athletics, \$5.00 to support Sports Clubs and \$2.00 to address deficits (mandatory costs such as insurance for Sports Clubs licensing fees for music, and insurance deductibles). Athletics would be responsible to fund student spirit initiatives. There are certain costs that the university waives or discounts to Athletics, such as Physical Plant and rent at Cox Arena; these costs would be adjusted so Athletics would pay the same as any other entity.

Mr. Osztreicher stated that alternative consultation would reach far more audiences than a fee referendum. The AS referendum in the Spring of 2008 10-12% of students cast votes. This is a complex issue that requires a dialogue, not just for Associated Students, but for others in general to make an educated decision. Associated Students will look for ways to engage with students and gage their opinion. Announcements regarding this fee will be posted on the Daily Aztec. Mr. Osztreicher plans on making a series of presentations to the Daily Aztec Editorial staff, student organizations, athletes, and the rest of the student population.

This proposed fee increase will be presented to CFAC as a voting item prior to being sent to the president. The timeline is still being worked on, but the fee request will be in process and should be able to come back to the CFAC committee over the next 6 to 8 weeks.

Mr. Prado explored the history of alternative consultation, which has been used more frequently by other campuses for more complex issues and wondered what constitutes success or failure and asked if people's opinion was important, since CFAC has a separate vote. Dr. Singer explained that the referendum is also advisory, just like alternative consultation. Mr. Cornthwaite did some research at other campuses and found a full range of activities to fulfill alternative consultation; he suggested doing what other campuses have done, which include a series of open forum, individual student organization meetings, presentations, discussions, scheduled meetings with attendance records. Two options to gage public opinion would be: 1) to take consensus and keep tally, or 2) to have meetings and ask organization presidents where the organization stands. CFAC's advice is based on its own sensibility to engage with students.

Ms. Byun asked about the criteria to determine which women sports to add to the program. Mr. Burns and Mr. Cornthwaite mentioned some criteria:

- Need in community
- Talent pool
- What's played in conferences
- Emerging sports
- Facility feasibility
- NCA status – a sport with at least 12 scholarships associated with it
- Potential to become varsity, which increases need and opportunity for grants-in-aide

Mr. Cornthwaite stated that Sports Clubs is a program of the Associated Students, with approximately 23 teams made of students who organize themselves and do a lot of their own fundraising; some of these have become varsity athletic teams, i.e. soccer, swimming and diving. He added that the \$5/semester would go to the Aztec Recreation program to help reduce the need for fundraising, out-of-pocket expenses, and to support travel. Most participants have to pay to be in a sports club; SDSU has a very successful ice hockey sport club that has to rent ice time. SDSU aspires to athletic programs that create a very positive atmosphere and increase student pride.

Mr. Talton asked about an alternative plan in case this fee increase does not pass. Mr. Burns responded that there was no alternative plan at this point. The president has drawn the line on additional general fund support for Athletics; he wants those resources in the classroom. One-time funding is running out. Reducing grant-in-aid to men sports is not a possibility, since SDSU must have 5 other men sports besides football and a total of 14 between men and women to be division 1-A compliant.

Mr. Talton asked about a possibility of lowering the proposed increase. The intent, per Mr. Burns, is to build enough cushion for the next four to five years. This is a very conservative and reasonable, pro-forma plan over 6 years. The campus president understands that the committee won't be back soon to ask for another increase in fees.

Athletics generates approximately \$3 million a year, which includes \$1.5 million a year in scholarship support; it also generates close to \$4 million in corporate support. The new softball and baseball fields were mainly donated by Tony Winn's family and alumni. Athletics is constantly looking to generate more funds from anywhere possible.

Ms. Byun asked about public opinion, especially those who don't care much about sports. Mr. Osztreicher commented that if SDSU loses division A-1 status, in his opinion, his diploma would be worth less. The school can get better recognition through Athletics. Ms. Reilly added that recognition also attracts more donations. Athletics is a major marketing tool for the university, per Dr. Singer, and asked to look at the best interest for the university.

Mr. Burns stated that the fee increase would free up one-time revenue, i.e. broadband lease revenue, to be placed in institution.

Dr. Ely suggested that all members remain impartial during this process. The committee will be voting at the next meeting to approve alternative consultation; the process outline will be finalized then.

Mr. Prado made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Ms. Byun.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 PM. The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, October 10<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 PM in SS-1608.