

CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

November 14, 2008

Revised 11/21/08

MINUTES**ATTENDEES**

Members:	Kimberlee Reilly Sean Delizo Joyce Byun Valerie Renegar David Ely	Ignacio Prado Grant Garske Joy Salvatin Julie Messer
Student Alternates	Megan McCoy	
Faculty/Staff Alternates:	Tim Quinnan	Sydney Covey
Non-Voting Member:	Ray Rainer	
Others/Guests:	Dan Cornthwaite Linda Stewart	Chuck Lang

The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. by Ms. Kimberlee Reilly, CFAC Committee Chair

Informational Item**a. Minutes from October 24, 2008 CFAC Meeting (Attachment 1)**

Dr. Ely made a motion to approve the CFAC minutes from October 24, which was seconded by Mr. Garske. The minutes were reviewed and approved unanimously with one correction to the second paragraph under Information Item: Ms. Reilly' remarks should be addressed as positive comments.

Information Items**a. Alternative Consultation Results Metric**

Ms. Reilly reported that she, Dr. Ely and Mr. Burns met prior to this meeting and discussed possible ways to count the results from the IRA Alternative Consultation presentations; they came up with three recommendations. Ms. Reilly introduced a handout outlining each of these three methods:

- Method #1 involves no metrics applied to the raw data from IRA Alternative Consultation. Each CFAC member would use their own measurement to interpret data.
- Method #2 weighs the results according to groups; there would be a total of 11 points under this method.
- Method #3 awards points according to the size and structure of organization according to their representation on the AS Council.

Dr. Ely welcomed the committee to come up with another method to be included and considered at this meeting.

Mr. Prado expressed concern over some councils that are included as student organizations. Unlike organizations, councils have a normal line of communication between council members and the students represented. Mr. Garske added that some organizations don't have elected representatives; councils are more structured, with represented seats which are counted and noted. The public forums would be closer to method 1 and should get 1 vote, since there is no specific representation and the same people could be attending each forum.

Per Mr. Cornthwaite, the AS Council should have a heavier weight because the council speaks on behalf of the student body and has that constituency that includes all the groups that participate in the process. Dr. Ely noted that in proposal #3 address difficult issues such as how to factor AS councils and public forums. He asked AS members if they vote as themselves or as constituents believe they should be voting. Ms. McCoy responded that she tries to make an educated vote, both as a College of Business Representative and as a student, but taking into account student benefits at large. She believes that committee members are the most educated on these topics because they participate in numerous discussions, are exposed to more information and have more time to ponder.

There was further discussion regarding the different methods and the best way to count the votes. Mr. Prado commented that the Greek organizations should carry more influence than the college councils due to the nature of their representation. Ms. McCoy explained that each individual Residence Hall voted (3600 students). The RHA voting process took two weeks.

There was no mention of actual tallies taken in individual organizations, per Mr. Cornthwaite; Ms. Reilly explained that the committee wants to look at the methods before looking at the tallies because they do not want the presentation results to influence the method chosen to count the results from the IRA Alternative Consultation.

Ms. McCoy noted that some student organizations, such as MEChA, AChA and RHA, have representation on AS and voted on AS level and student organization level. There is no breakdown of who voted in AS Council; only the vote tally was noted.

The committee looked at the different organizations and considered membership versus representation and direct versus indirect representation. Mr. Delizo agreed that it is hard to separate membership and representation. Ms. Salvatin supports method #1 and believes everyone on CFAC is educated to make the best decision.

Dr. Ely noted that only one of these methods goes by AS bylaws, but if it is not good for this purpose then it's hard to support as a metric.

Ms. Byun made a motion to adopt method #1; Ms. Salvatin seconded the motion. Ten members voted in favor of method one; there was one no vote and no abstentions.

b. Alternative Consultation Results

Mr. Rainer presented the Alternative Consultation Results and explained that sometimes the total votes don't match the attendance because some people left early – before voting. The results include number of students in attendance, votes for/against, percentage breakdowns with and without abstentions. The open forums were treated the same way but there are no endorsements involved. He received 28 emails, 25 that expressed an opinion, 3 in support of the fee and 18 opposed; the rest wanted more information and refrained from expressing an opinion. There is no endorsement from the United Sorority & Fraternity Council (USFC). Associated Students also received seven letters opposing the fee and none in support.

The committee is to look at results and a vote will be taking at the next meeting. It was asked that the results not be disclosed until the end of the process.

Mr. Delizo made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Ms. Byun. The meeting adjourned at 2:44 PM. The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, November 21st at 2:00 PM in SS-1608.