

**CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

November 21, 2008

**MINUTES****ATTENDEES**

Members:	Kimberlee Reilly	Ignacio Prado
	Sean Delizo	Grant Garske
	Joyce Byun	David Ely
	Ethan Singer	Julie Messer
	James Poet	Joy Salvatin
	Daniel Osztreicher	Eric Rivera
Faculty/Staff Alternates:	Kathy LaMaster	
Non-Voting Member:	Ray Rainer	
Others/Guests:	Scott Burns	
	Daniel Brown	
	Brent Schrottenboer, Union Tribune Staff	

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

**Informational Item****a. Minutes from November 14, 2008 CFAC Meeting (Attachment 1)**

Mr. Poet made a motion to approve the CFAC minutes, which was seconded by Mr. Prado. The minutes were reviewed; a member's name was moved to the correct attendee category and there was a correction to a last name. The minutes were approved unanimously.

**Action Item****a. Proposed 2008 IRA Fee Increase**

Mr. Rainer presented an update of the Alternative Consultation Results, which includes the endorsement from the United Sorority and Fraternity Council received after CFAC's last meeting. He also received four additional emails, one supporting the IRA fee increase, two opposing it and one that indicated there were signatures collected opposing the fee; he provided all the contact information for this person to send the signatures before this meeting, but he did not receive them prior to the meeting. Mr. Rainer also received two letters opposing the IRA fee increase.

Mr. Osztreicher asked to see all the emails received regarding the IRA fee increase; these were reviewed by the committee as well.

At the last meeting it was decided that each member would use own judgment to analyze the endorsement results.

Mr. Poet made a motion to support the IRA Fee Increase and did not object deliberating in the presence of a representative from The San Diego Union Tribune; the motion was seconded by Ms. Salvatin. All members of the committee agreed with deliberating in the presence of Mr. Schrottenboer, Staff Writer for The San Diego Union Tribune.

Discussion regarding the IRA fee ensued. Dr. Ely stated that it would be helpful to hear some of the discussion that took place at the AS Council meeting, since it was the most detailed and extensive. Mr. Osztreicher noted that students were frustrated with the new process; alternative consultation was unexpected, even though there were no issues regarding the distribution of funds. Mr. Burns countered that the process was not the main issue at the AS Council meeting; the main arguments were about the use of the fee and the amount. There was also discussion for and against the fee increase, as well as questions regarding where numbers came from and sources of revenue. Mr. Poet agreed that only one to two members questioned the process, but most of the discussion was specific to the fee, purpose, breakdown and consequences of not meeting gender equity requirements. There was also discussion on how people came to their decisions; those in favor and against the fee talked about how they went back to their constituencies, how they met with the college councils and the groups they represent; they presented their constituents with facts and got feedback from them.

Mr. Prado talked about the issue of transparency in general, mainly regarding the breakdown of funds. Mr. Garske agreed, but noted that opinions changed as the understanding of issues became clear with further discussions.

Dr. Ely asked about reasons behind votes for and against the IRA fee increase at the AS Council meeting. According to Mr. Burns, individual council members voted to represent their constituents and based on feedback they received. From the data presented, Ms. Salvatin observed that the number of those organizations that did not support the fee would explain the closeness of the votes at the AS Council. Mr. Prado added that his organization's (College of Arts and Letters) votes were split, but the majority voted based on what's good for the institution. Those who support the fee are looking at what is best for this institution and those who oppose the fee are looking at accessibility and argue that students are not wealthy and that this is not a private institution. Ms. Byun also shared some of the reactions she encountered regarding this fee: those opposed asked why this fee should fall upon students, and viewed this fee as unfair and unnecessary; those who supported the fee looked at the broader perspective and the greater benefit to the university.

In terms of the data presented, Dr. Ely asked about the committee's sense of overall support of the fee, since the data looks pretty mixed. Ms. Reilly responded that it depends on how each member looks at the data. Mr. Delizo noted that the data looks pretty split, but it seemed that the student organizations had a preconceived opinion, even though some were open to new ideas. Ms. Salvatin added that by looking at the data she can see that most students are in favor of the fee. Mr. Poet explained how he looked at the data:

- First he looked at the AS Council – elected representatives of student body who voted in favor of the IRA fee increase.
- Next he looked at the College Councils, since they are a broad representation of entire student body, and their endorsements - with 4 colleges against and three in favor of the fee.
- Finally he looked at the number of students that represent each college and the number of votes tallied up, which show the majority in favor of the fee.

Per Ms. Reilly, the committee will send a statement to President Weber based on how the committee votes; this statement submission will include back up data and a list of comments students have made. The interpretation of this data is important, as well as the data that includes the pro and con statements. All the minutes will be included in the back up documentation as well.

Mr. Poet moved to question; a vote was taken, and all members unanimously voted in favor of supporting the IRA Fee Increase; there were no objections and no abstentions.

Mr. Poet suggested reviewing the alternative consultation process, perhaps at the next meeting – looking at what worked or did not work. It would be wise to establish minimum requirements to use alternative consultation in the future, as well as establish criteria and guidelines.

Ms. Messer made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Mr. Prado. The meeting adjourned at 2:50 PM. The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 5<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 PM in SS-1608.