

CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

December 05, 2008

MINUTES**ATTENDEES**

Members:	Kimberlee Reilly James Poet Joyce Byun Ethan Singer David Ely Valerie Renegar	Ignacio Prado Grant Garske Daniel Osztreicher Julie Messer Eric Rivera
Student Alternates:	Daniel Brown	
Non-Voting Member:	Ray Rainer	
Others/Guests:	Scott Burns	Marilyn Newhoff

The meeting was called to order at 2:03 P.M. by Ms. Kimberlee Reilly, CFAC Committee Chair

Informational Item**a. Minutes from November 21, 2008 CFAC Meeting (Attachment 1)**

Mr. Garske made a motion to approve the CFAC minutes, which was seconded by Mr. Osztreicher. The minutes were reviewed and approved unanimously.

Information Item**a. Amendment to Audiology Fee Implementation**

Dr. Singer gave an overview of the Audiology fee, which has been approved by CFAC. This fee has been discussed by President Weber and Chancellor Reed. The Chancellor's Office is not comfortable with this fee as a program fee. It was decided that the only way to move forward with this fee is to impose course fees on each of the Au.D. courses that over four years would equal the exact amount of the total approved fee. The \$40,000 is an accommodation fee for SDSU students to go to UCSD. Dr. Singer is asking the committee to endorse the same amount of money, but instead of under a program rubric, it would be under a course accommodation fee approach, which the campus president has authority to approve. The curriculum for these students is fixed. There are a few electives, but the number of units per year is the same.

Dr. Newhoff explained that these students are all full time and SDSU is the only school in California offering the entry level Audiology degree. This program ranks among the top ten programs in the nation. All students are aware that the fee will likely be in place by next fall; it's also been announced on the programs website. The Student Council has approved this fee for the third time. This is a joint program, but students enter the program at SDSU; they are never considered UCSD students, even though they spend a year at UCSD. Students take 15 units in summer, fall and spring terms; even with the new fees, this program is cheaper than Northwest University and The University of Memphis. SDSU is the only university in California with an Audiology program; the next closest university with an Audiology program would be the University of Arizona or Arizona State University.

Dr. Renegar commented that this is a valuable program the university wants to keep.

Dr. Ely asked if revenues are still aligned with expenses; Dr. Newhoff explained that this fee is strictly intended to cover UCSD costs, so there is a match between revenues and expenses.

Dr. Singer will double check the amount limits with the 5% increase provision over five years to see if it would require approval from the Chancellor's Office. The 5% is to cover the cost increases each year at UCSD.

Mr. Osztreicher made a motion to move this item to action, which was seconded by Mr. Prado. The committee unanimously moved this item to action.

Action Item**a. Au.D. Fee with provision for 5% increase each year**

Mr. Poet moved to approve the Au.D. fee with the 5% increase; this motion was seconded to Mr. Garske. The committee unanimously approved the Au.D. fee with the 5% increase; there were no abstentions and no objections.

Information Item

b. CFAC Chair Meeting with President on IRA Fee Increase

Mr. Burns and Ms. Reilly met with President Weber shortly after the Nov. 21st CFAC meeting and presented him with a IRA Fee Increase packet including the charts, copies of all endorsements from all student organizations, minutes from all meetings and all student comments (positive and negative). President Weber asked if presenters were giving their own opinions, to which Ms. Reilly and Mr. Burns responded no; presenters stated that they were just presenting the facts, not their opinions. President Weber also asked if the committee would be working on a process for alternative consultation in the future, to which Ms. Reilly responded that the committee had already discussed that at the meeting and that they would be working on this at the next meeting. President Weber thanked everyone for their hard work. Mr. Burns added that the meeting with President Weber was more of a dialog about the pros and cons of alternative consultation, what was learned throughout the process and the discussions that took place in this committee; the President was focused on putting alternative consultation guidelines in place, as Mr. Poet had suggested. President Weber understood the results and what the numbers represented.

Dr. Ely asked if there were any efforts by groups or individuals to contact the president directly. Per Mr. Burns, President Weber received less than a dozen emails during the process, most of which were responded to by Betsy Kinsley, Chief of Staff. There was an organization that attempted to meet with the president, but it was decided that it would not be appropriate, as the president did not meet with any other student organizations. Per M. Poet, that organization is not a recognized student organization.

c. Review of the Alternative Consultation Process

Ms. Reilly presented an outline of what was done during alternative consultation and included guidelines on the alternative consultation process from Cal Poly.

Mr. Brown commented that emailing students worked, since it's a sure way to reach everyone and students are still responsible for their own emails. Mr. Garske suggested that students sign in with their Red IDs to ensure feedback is not counted twice. He also suggested placing notifications of a specific size on the Daily Aztec. Ms. Byun suggested better advertisement of the web site, since students mostly found out about it during presentations. Dr. Ely commented that in the past referendums the link was included in the CFAC web site and on the front page of the SDSU web site. Per Ms. Byun, a lot of times students don't visit the SDSU web site unless they are looking for something. Per Mr. Burns, the web site was listed on the Daily Aztec Ads and it was included in the emails. Mr. Prado commented that the IRA fee would have been perfect in the topical banner on the SDSU web site.

Mr. Osztreicher reviewed the Cal Poly guidelines and suggested coming up with something better, since this committee has already done so much more. He suggested including a minimum time period to inform students. From the ASI President of Cal Poly he found that students are not much interested in the process; they just want to know what it is about. Cal Poly provides 45 academic days, excluding weekends, for students to know about new fees; they also provide pamphlets with cons and pros from an outside perspective.

Mr. Burns asked if the guidelines and requirements from alternative consultation would be more stringent than those for a referendum. There are currently no guidelines for a referendum. Per Mr. Poet, the alternative consultation process should be more extensive than the referendum process, so it is appropriate to have more rules and regulations. He also suggested the following:

- Have at least one or two members of CFAC at every open forum and presentation
- Branch out to more organizations than just the ones in the AS Council
- Find a system and define how to select presenters
- Find a way of producing unbiased presenters
- Minimum number of people to consult with in order to be considered effective, i.e. 500 - 1000
- Use the Red ID to document who is voting
- Blog or online message board
- Handout with pros and cons

Ms. Reilly noted that a lot of the presenters did not state that they were members of CFAC, not just the AS Council. Alternative consultation is not intended to touch the same number of people as a referendum.

Mr. Osztreicher suggested a person representing each stakeholder, i.e. someone from the senate, the administration, etc.

Mr. Garske expressed concern regarding blogging, since the issues could be highly convoluted. The wrong information in a public area can produce biased opinions. The point is to make sure information gets to as many people possible.

Mr. Rivera mentioned the state newsletter for students, which could be set up to accept comments and for advertising purposes. He also agreed that blogging is hard to control.

Mr. Burns warned about soliciting a response that doesn't factor into the decision. The committee needs to determine what would be considered official input. Official input would be in the context of a presentation or forum and a vote with a position statement from that club or organization. Should invalidated email comments be counted as official input?

Mr. Prado brought up the importance of clarity regarding representation, position, source of numbers and source of process proposal.

Dr. Ely liked the idea to have someone clearly defined as a neutral person and two other individuals, one to represent the pro position and the other to represent the con position; these two individuals could also write pro and con statements to be published on the website. He also recommends a more systematic way to capture the logic behind the endorsements to understand why such decisions were made by the different organizations. Otherwise, it would seem that a more appropriate process would be to do a blend of alternative consultation and referendum with open forums and group presentations, but instead of asking for decisions from group leaders, have students vote through Web Portal. Dr. Singer noted that this is basically a referendum; normally with a referendum a lot of groups are visited, so this almost negates the purpose of alternative consultation. Per Dr. Ely, the only difference between these two processes is how student interest is gaged. Dr. Singer agreed that there has to be minimum criteria to represent students' opinions, but the two processes don't mix. Mr. Poet agreed that it was important to define the differences between the two processes and capture why the decisions were made and the discussions that took place.

Mr. Burns asked if clubs and organizations would take the time to write a narrative statement; yes, if it's a requirement, per Mr. Poet. The president could take into account the rationale behind the decisions to make his judgment. Mr. Prado added that it would not take an enormous amount of time for group leaders to write a statement. Group leaders would summarize the reasons behind their decision, based on their constituency.

Mr. Brown stated that having the two processes and making them very separate could be very useful and valuable to the campus president. He agreed with Mr. Poet in having a minimum number of seats required to recognize that the process has been accounted for; his concern with this process is that it was expected to reach a larger number of students than a referendum, but this actually didn't take place. The organizations only represent their own members; there are over 260 recognized student organizations, but only a few are part of the college council. The reason why some of the student clubs and organizations are not on the college council, per Mr. Poet, is that they are represented through one of the college councils. Mr. Brown noted that the application process for college council for those organizations that are not academically oriented is very extensive.

Dr. Ely asked when it would be appropriate to use one process over the other; Ms. Reilly responded that this would be up to the campus president. President Weber is not asking for criteria for using one process over the other.

The rules for the referendum come from the executive order, but the committee has adopted the process and voting structure from the AS Bylaws, but the referendum is still CFAC's responsibility; the committee has the authority to establish a different set of referendum guidelines than what exists in AS – for non AS issues.

Regarding what qualifies as official feedback, Mr. Garske stated that it is important to have a process that would push people to a certain area or place to have their votes counted; people can voice their opinions as they please, but there is only one place and time to have their votes counted. The issue is to get students to attend, per Mr. Brown. Ms. Reilly agreed that it is important to come up with a way for more students to attend these presentations. More forums with smaller audiences are better than a few with large numbers, per Dr. Ely. Mr. Brown suggested adding more time and forums if the numbers are not reached.

Mr. Garske made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Mr. Prado. The meeting adjourned at 3:00 P.M. The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 23rd at 2:00 PM in SS-1608.