

## CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

November 15, 2022

### MINUTES

#### **ATTENDEES**

Members:	Norma Aguilar	Meena Alexander
	Jazmyn Horton-Alvarado	Sophia Koch
	Sandy Mekany	Shawki Moore
	Rashmi Praba	Mikhail Portnoy
	Katie Robinson	Robson Winter
	Amanda Wilson	

Guests:	CoCo Bazemore	Michael Farley
	Crystal Little	Rose Pasenelli
	Chip Pierce	Mark Reed
	Bill Tong	

The meeting was called to order at 12:34 P.M. by Katie Robinson, CFAC Chair. Robinson mentioned that she would be adding an informational item on the Imperial Valley Student Success Fee

#### **Review and Approval Meeting Minutes**

Robinson asked if there were any questions or comments for last meeting's minutes before the committee moved to approve. There were none. Rashmi Praba motioned to approve. Amanda Wilson seconded the motion. Meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

#### **Informational Items**

- a. Imperial Valley Student Success Fee

Robinson shared the posters that would be put around campus on a-frames and asked for feedback on the colors and wording. There was a recommendation to edit the phrasing on expanding the fee.

- b. New Member- Karen Macauley

Robinson shared that the third senate-appointed seat on CFAC has been filled by Karen Macauley.

#### **Proposals**

- a. Proposed Category II Fee

Robinson provided a brief overview and introduced the fee proposal for the Category II fee to be charged to non-resident students. The fee proposal was in draft form and had several areas that were still in flux. Some of these were based on recent suggestions from the Associated Students, and some were areas where additional information is pending. The fee will be moving forward through an alternative consultation process to allow more thoughtful discussion and feedback, as well as ensuring participation and representation across varying demographics.

Crystal Little shared that the fee has been named the Opportunity Fee, similar to Cal Poly San Luis Obispo since it is charged to the same population, and it used for similar purposes. This would allow consistency across the system. There was some concern that the word "opportunity" didn't clearly convey who would be charged the fee, or what it would be used for. There is language in the pamphlet that outlines the fee would not be charged to doctoral students or graduate students serving as Teaching Assistants in order to advance the university's teaching and research mission. Little shared the campus is still working with the Chancellor's Office and General Council to get a better understanding of how to implement a scholarship for Native American students, so the language around that portion of the fee uses may be slightly altered. Chip Pierce explained that the current working definition of middle class is those students whose Expected Family Contribution (EFC) is higher than the Pell eligibility cutoff.

There were two areas that were expanded based on student feedback: explicitly stating SDSU's commitment to meet its resident enrollment target as funded by the CSU system; and addressing a request to see hiring of academic advisors reflect the demographics of students on campus. Both of these sections are in process to ensure the phrasing matches the intention of the recommendations.

The final update to the information pamphlet is a tentative 5% allocation to the CSU system. This reflects the agreement that is currently in place with SLO as they implemented their non-resident fee. Leadership is still determining if this 5% would be taken from a certain use category, or taken off the top with the remaining 95% distributed proportionately. Robinson noted that they will be forming a sub-committee to finalize the information packet and help identify what groups of students should be included in the alternative consultation process. Praba volunteered for the committee and Brandon Bartosh later shared that he would be interested in joining.

### **Action Items**

- a. Student Success Fee Academic Related Programs

Praba shared an update on the Academic Related Programs, which is the 10% of the Student Success Fee that is allocated to student programming. Student Affairs and Campus Diversity reimagined the proposal process in the prior year, resulting in expanded participation. A large part of the new process was an expanded marketing campaign, as well as providing support to students throughout the proposal timeline. There were 144 proposals submitted, of which 113 were approved through committee review. The total funding request for those 113 approved proposals equaled just over \$2.8M. Between current year revenue and carryforward from previous years there is an available resource of approximately \$3.6M. Moore asked for clarification as to why proposals were not accepted. Praba responded that the committee reviews proposals within a framework that includes depth and breadth of impact, feasibility, and quality of writing; some may not be accepted if the proposal is in violation of the Student Success Fee policies. The decisions were not made based on availability of resources, and groups that were rejected were provided feedback and encouraged to apply again in the next cycle. Moore moved to approve the list of pre-approved Academic Related Programs. Sophia Koch seconded and the motion was approved unanimously.

### **Requests**

- a. None

### **New Business**

- a. None

### **Public Comment**

- a. None

Robinson adjourned the meeting at 1:32 P.M.

**Reminder:** Next meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 2<sup>nd</sup> at 11:00 am. via Zoom.