

## CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

October 11, 2013

### MINUTES

#### ATTENDEES

Members:	Josh Morse	Mariah Kelly
	Morgan Chan	Kevin Hancock
	Rebecca Cohen	Javier Gomez
	Linda Lewiston	Kimberlee Reilly
	Jonathan Cole	David Ely
	Kathy LaMaster	
Non-voting member:	Crystal Little	
Guests:	Loretta Leavitt	Cindy Best
	Dan Cornthwaite	Daniella Vargas

The meeting was called to order at 2:01 P.M. by Josh Morse, CFAC Chair.

#### **Approval of September 13, 2013 CFAC Meeting Minutes**

The minutes were reviewed. Changes were noted to reflect correct spelling of Reilly and added David Ely to attendee list. Ms. Kelly motioned to approved the minutes, which was seconded by Mr. Cole. The minutes with noted changes were approved unanimously.

#### **Informational Items**

a. Approved Cat V - Parking Fines & Forfeiture Fees

Discussed parking fines & forfeiture fees and promoting awareness to students of the impending changes. BFA will provide additional information at the next meeting, particularly to address concerns regarding the new bike impound fee.

#### **Fee Requests**

a. Proposal for Student Success Fee

Student Success Fee proposal was presented and distributed to the committee by AVP Kathy LaMaster. Josh clarified CFAC's role on the fee proposal, which is to determine the best fit: either alternative consultation, referendum or advise against the fee. He further clarified the overall purpose of voting and decision making.

AVP LaMaster went over the sections in the Student Success Fee Proposal handout. The goals included in the university's strategic plan are: student success, research and community endeavors, and community and communication. The initiatives to support these goals require more tenure-track faculty to provide greater student experiences, classes, enhanced value of degree, and shorter time to graduation. If the student success fee moves forward, 10% has been suggested toward student activities with the rest towards tenure-track faculty hires. This would be a campus based mandatory fee, so funds would stay on this campus. A student survey was launched earlier this week to gather student input and tolerance for a student success fee. If the fee was set at \$200/semester/student it would support 80 new tenure track positions and would include support funding to colleges. This fee would be implemented over time – gradually increasing to the full per term amount. AVP LaMaster recommended alternative consultation because of the complexity of the fee. Alternative consultation would allow for more in depth discussion and increased opportunity for questions and answers.

Mr. Cornthwaite explained the alternative consultation process and timeline. He has been working with the President's Office for the past few weeks discussing this fee as part of the strategic plan. Survey results will assist in developing the final recommendation that will come back to CFAC for what the actual fee proposal will be. The alternate consultation process would involve a 3 week period in February which includes a series of meetings to provide extensive campus-wide dialogue with students, student groups, and the college councils to discuss the elements of the fee and answer questions. Students feedback would be gathered at these meetings to develop a comprehensive perspective of student opinion. Based on these data, CFAC will then develop a recommendation to the President as to whether the student success fee should be implemented and how. There will be series of notices and other milestones that will lead up to the February time period, which is outlined in EO 1054 to provide advanced notice to students, timeline to produce voter pamphlet similar to referendum process that incorporates soliciting pro & con statements from students, running ads in the Aztec,

public forums, and individual meetings with student organizations, student groups, and AS council/boards. The issue today is determining if alternative consultation is the most effective way to communicate what the fee will or will not do.

A referendum and alternative consultation would be similar with a minimum 30 day advanced notice publication in the Aztec. Both processes can include open forums and discussions with student organizations.

Alternative consultation would be a 3 week campus-wide dialogue. A referendum follows guidelines from AS Elections Committee code section 7; it would include a 2-day online voting window.

Mr. Gomez commented that alternative consultation would be the best way to inform students about the complexities of this fee and it would provide the best way to give an objective presentation; student voice is more prevalent and there are more direct answers. Alternative consultation includes open forums and group meetings, where students can hear about the proposed fee, ask questions and provide feedback.

Ms. Chan clarified that if the benefits of a referendum and alternative consultation could be achieved concurrently, then more students could have access to a vote via a referendum. The committee acknowledged that alternative consultation requires students to attend a meeting to voice a position and schedules may not allow some students to attend because of classes, work, commuting, etc. Mr. Morse commented that although access to open forums is the biggest challenge in the alternative consultation process, he informed CFAC that it is our role to address those concerns and create solutions to make the process accessible and equitable to all students.

Alternative consultation ensures that feedback is collected from only those who are educated about the fee,, whereas a referendum allows all students to express an opinion through a vote regardless of what they know about the fee; if they want to vote no because they simply cannot afford it they should have that opportunity. There is also concern over the number of students that participate in alternative consultation versus a referendum. The committee discussed having open forums and meetings where more students could become better informed before casting their vote. A referendum does not preclude having open forums and/or group meetings to educate student voters about the fee.

Both mechanisms should provide a fair and objective presentation of the fee proposal to students. The voter pamphlet will include the fee proposal, financials and pro/con statements.

The committee discussed using new technologies to inform as many students as possible about the fee proposal and enable them to provide feedback. An example would be making a video available to educate students on the fee proposal - maybe require that students watch it before submitting feedback.

CFAC is to recommend the mechanism to move the proposal forward. Once the President makes his decision, then the committee will have input in developing the alternative consultation process/timeline. This could include setting thresholds for number of meetings, participants, voters, etc.

#### **Action Items**

- a. CFAC recommendation to the President regarding the preferred process to be used to determine student's support of the proposed Student Success Fee.

AVP LaMaster made the motion to recommend alternative consultation as the mechanism to achieve appropriate and meaningful consultation for the proposed student success fee, which as seconded by Mr. Gomez. The motion was approved with 6 votes in favor and 5 opposed, there were no abstentions. President Hirshman will review the recommendation and report back his decision.

#### **New Business**

Ms. Little mentioned that there may be changes to the meeting schedule and a need to form sub-committees to review pro/con statements and information pamphlets.

Mr. Morse made the motion to adjourn the meeting, which was moved by Mr. Gomez and seconded by Mr. Hancock. The meeting adjourned at 3:15 P.M.

**Reminder:** Next Meeting is scheduled for Friday, October 25, 2013 at 2:00 PM in SS-1608.