

# CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

April 23, 2004

## MINUTES

### ATTENDEES

#### Members:

Truong Diep	David Ely
Tommy Ishida	Ethan Singer
Kristina Jacobs	Linda Stewart
Josh Miller	
Jeff Obayashi	
Juanita Salas (Chair)	
Scott Simpson	

#### Voting Alternates:

Bob Cademy  
Patrick Papin  
Lori White

Non-Voting Member: Ed Bulinski

#### Guests:

Melissa Johnson  
Kelli Kedis  
Patricia Kroncke  
Deborah Quiett  
Jarad Sanchez  
Tom Wilson

Meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. by Chair, Salas.

### **AGENDA**

A change was made to the Agenda by Cademy to add an information item—Election Codes. Minutes from the March 23 meeting were approved and appear on the CFAC website.

### **INFORMATION ITEM**

Debbie Quiett spoke on behalf of Lorretta Leavitt, University Controller, who was not available regarding the dishonored payment charge increase from \$20 to \$35. The fee hasn't been increased since 1993. The justification was included in the packet. The increase would take effect in Fall, 2004. Ely asked what the process would involve on a paper check. Quiett said that the bank would be involved first, then Accounting, Cashier's Office, and Collection's Department. Jacobs asked why not ask for the total anticipated cost of \$38.59 and Quiett stated that the Ed Code 6157 and 6159 was used in determining the fee of \$35 that would be a reasonable charge not to exceed the actual costs incurred by the public agency. A final vote will be taken on May 7.

### **INFORMATION ITEM**

Patricia Kroncke spoke regarding an Internet reconnection (RezCon) fee of \$25 which would be charged to resident hall students who are disconnected from the University network due to violation of the University's Acceptable Use Policy. The fee for a second or subsequent reconnection shall be \$75. Each resident hall student would be required to go through a tutorial that would require completion to continue use of the network. McAfee virus software would automatically install and would periodically update itself automatically. Cademy said that a number of other campuses have this type of fee and it is not something new. This will become an action item at the May 7 meeting.

### **INFORMATION ITEM**

Tom Wilson from Student Health Services outlined augmented Health Services Fees. Bulinski noted that EO 746 authorizes Category III, Augmented Health Services fees that range from \$9 to \$600.

Crutch Dispensing Fee Change - \$15 to purchase crutches and not a deposit of \$25 to rent that is in effect now. This will save in a decrease in staff hours and paperwork to track returned crutches.

Optometry Fee Change - \$25 advance service deposit. This fee would be applied to normal charges incurred such as the eye exam and glasses or contacts. If they don't show up for the appointment, the \$25 would not be returned. This encourages patients to show up. It was noted that fee could be avoided if appointment was cancelled 24 hours in advance or on a case-by-case basis for less than 24 hours with a valid excuse. Wilson said that he would add that verbiage to the request.

Students between semesters fee - This would enable students between semesters with ongoing health care needs to continue to be seen and not create an undue financial burden on them by requiring them to see public providers or pay visit fees. Student would pay the same rate as registered students for that semester – currently, \$85 for Fall and Spring and \$69 for Summer, rather than a per visit fee.

Continuing care fee – Executive Order 814 allows patients to be seen for continuing care after they have graduated or are no longer an enrolled student planning on returning the following semester. The proposed fee per patient visit would be \$20. Under the EO, the student would be allowed to continue to receive care up to four weeks from the first day of the next semester that follows their last enrollment, using the Academic calendar as the basis for the start date.

These 4 requests will become an action items at the May 7 meeting.

### **INFORMATION ITEM**

Referendum cost disclosures in the packet includes 1 statement for PRO on Pool Referendum (\$10,077), 1 statement for CON on IRA fee (\$200.89), and 1 statement for PRO on IRA fee (\$10,928.42). Cademy asked whether some hours spent on referendum by state employees be reflected. Bulinski stated that the time spent by administrators, advocating the need for the increase, is considered part of their job.

Official referendum voting results handed out. Also a memo from Jennifer Esquivel-Parker, Assistant to the Executive Director, was included that outlined 5 incidents that had no discernable impact on the results that occurred during the course of the two days of voting. Cornthwaite stated that the voting for this referendum was a slightly higher (approximately 14% turnout) than past referendums.

### **INFORMATION ITEM**

Cademy elaborated on several election codes that may have been violated. The sections he cited were from the A.S. Bylaws, Article II, Section 7: 7.03b, 7.04, 7.05c, 7.07a and 7.07b. The relevance of A.S. Bylaws to CFAC was questioned and Cademy mentioned that under the Presidential charge to CFAC: “The University shall follow the Associated Students Election Code (Article II, Section 7) regarding the student fee referendum process...” (Note: Balance of this charge from the President also includes the following statement: “CFAC may propose supplemental requirements as appropriate.”) After much discussion it was concluded that these alleged infractions should be researched and spoken to at the next meeting. It may be an A.S. council issue that would need their review and action if necessary.

### **ACTION ITEM**

**A motion was made by Miller and seconded by Jacobs to recommend to the President the approval of the IRA fee.** Miller is in favor of sending an approval recommendation forward because the results were close enough and backed up by enough other representative groups. The school will have major difficulties if it doesn't go into effect. Many students didn't understand the referendum. He believes that it will be a fee that is accepted by the students. Obayashi **stated** that we live in a democratic society where the majority rules, and the students said no and that should be respected. To say that we're going to go against this process is definitely a problem. The referendum was very close, so we need to work with the Chancellor's Office to have another referendum to see if we can have an all-academic fee and in other campuses those have passed overwhelmingly. Are we here to represent the students or representing ourselves? The students have spoken that this is the way they want to go. Jacobs said that she recommends this fee to the President knowing how much it would hurt our university if not recommended and it is in the best interest of our students. Sanchez said that by ignoring the student vote sends a message that questions the legitimacy of the entire referendum process. The students will not feel that they have a voice in regards to their own future or pocketbooks. This fee will force an average student to work extra to pay for it. It seems unfair that this fee is being promoted as an academic fee when the department that will benefit the most is athletics. We are asking 30,000 students to subsidize 450 athletes. He wonders what the difference in vote would have been if more money had been spent on the no vote. The students have decided that they don't want this particular fee. Singer said that the student vote is an advisory vote and assures everyone that the President is taking note of that vote and his decision will take that into account. It's our job at CFAC to make a recommendation and we have an independent role to play. From Academic Affairs perspective this fee is absolutely essential to offer the courses we need to offer next year. We started this year with a significant amount of reserves and our permanent reserves are down to approximately \$500,000 and our temporary reserves dropped by three quarters. Academic Affairs also faces an additional budget cut of \$3.1 million. The initial round of courses will affect principally our new students coming into the University. They will not have the courses they need. If the fee increase is approved by the President which the Ed Code and EO gives him the authority to do with advise from CFAC and the referendum we will be adding additional courses beyond the 300 that we've already identified that must be in the class schedule. With regard to Athletics, it is the University's responsibility to maintain the fiscal soundness of Athletics and if these fee revenues are not there, their budget will be

balanced with monies from all the divisions. There are times at which one needs to look at the broader picture of the needs of the University. We are desperate for this money and need it on a permanent basis and would urge this committee to support this fee. Kelli Kedis, the future A.S. president, said that most students were not aware of what the fee meant. Because we are the voice of the students, we need to take an active stand and supports the fee. Ishida said that it's easy for students to say they don't want to pay more money for fees and it's hard to grasp what this fee would mean. They didn't realize that more classes would be available and is in favor of this recommendation. Sanchez said that student confusion is not valid. The closeness of any referendum should not be considered. To ignore the student vote is foolish and that is how referendums have been decided in the past. Most students cannot afford this fee, and it will not be covered by financial aid.

**Miller moved and Jacobs seconded to go into the previous question and closing debate. Motion passed with 9 in favor, 1 against, and 2 abstaining.** Miller then restated the original motion to recommend approval of the IRA fee increase to the President. **A motion was made by Obayashi and seconded by Diep to vote by roll call. Motion passed.**

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstention</u>
Miller	Obayashi	Cademy
Ishida		
Jacobs		
Diep		
Simpson		
Singer		
White		
Stewart		
Papin		
Ely		

**Motion passed.**

**A motion was made by Miller and seconded by Jacobs to approve the recommendation for the student body fee increase for the pool to the President.** Miller said we should have the pool and the students agreed and it's a great idea. Question called with no objections. Acclamation called with no objection. **Motion passed by acclamation.**

**A motion as made by Cademy and seconded by Ishida to adjourn, and the meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.**

Respectfully Submitted by

Rosemary Patrick  
Business & Financial Affairs