

CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

December 10, 2010

MINUTES**ATTENDEES**

Members:	David Ely Amanda Pascoe Candice Luistro Kevin Gruidl Ethan Singer Martha Ruel for Eric Rivera	Grant Mack Krista Parker Kimberlee Reilly Laura Schofield Debra Bertram
Student Alternates:	Chanelle McNutt	Tom Rivera
Non voting member:	Ray Rainer	
Guests:	Gail Naughton	

The meeting was called to order at 2:06 P.M. by Dr. David Ely, CFAC Chair.

Approval of October 29, 2010 CFAC Meeting Minutes (Attachment 1)

The minutes were reviewed. Ms. Parker made a motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded by Mr. Gruidl. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Informational Items:**a. Approved SHS Fee Increase (Attachment 2)**

Dr. Ely presented the approved SHS fee increase packet, which includes recommendation letters from Dr. Ely to BFA Vice President Sally Roush and President Weber, President Weber's approval of the SHS fee increase, student feedback as well as supporting documentation for the alternative consultation process.

b. Proposed Excellence Fee Spring Referendum

Dr. Gail Naughton, Dean of the College of Business Administration, presented the proposed Excellence Fee. The Academic Deans Council has been looking at ways to provide students with a competitive edge in their career. They have looked at what other campuses have done to distinguish themselves in their programs, specifically the excellence fee implemented in 2001 by San Luis Obispo.

The Academic Deans Council has conducted several focus groups over the summer asking; Dr. Naughton met personally with student councils across the university, as well as faculty. Based on the input from focus groups and individual interviews to students, alumni, faculty and employers, a survey was sent out this Friday to SDSU students. There have been 4500 respondents as of this morning and close to 6000 are expected by Monday.

The following groups have responded:

21% Juniors
36% Seniors
23% Graduate students

The following are areas of major importance to students:

84% Enhancing the value of a degree from SDSU
73% Getting a competitive edge and securing a meaningful job upon graduation
80% Being able to succeed and advance in a career
40% More interactive classes, more internship programs, more hands-on-learning and ability to graduate within 4 years

There were also college specific questions. The following are some college-specific responses:

College of Business:	An undergraduate career center just for Business students, timely graduation
Engineering:	More supplies for student projects, more access to software and more internships
Nursing:	Smaller clinical assignments, more equipment, and study abroad
PSFA:	More sections of core classes, paid internships and newer equipment

Internships were strong across the colleges, not just for credit, but paid internships. Student input has provided ideas as to what's important for students.

The current proposal is that the fee be implemented over a 3-year period.

The CFAC committee discussed the timetable for this referendum. The announcement needs to be approved by CFAC in time for the ad to be published by the Daily Aztec the first day of classes, which is January 19th. Dr. Ely noted that the Daily Aztec requires the ad four business days before it's published; this ad would announce the referendum and solicit pro/con statements. This ad will also be published on the web. Students will be given a few days to submit pro/con statements, as well as rebuttals. The timing of these drives the timeline for the referendum, since the executive order is very specific as to when these events have to take place. Most of the work is done by the subcommittee, but the CFAC committee needs to approve the material. Mr. Rainer went over the major deadlines for the referendum and distributed a draft of the referendum timeline; the early deadlines will be revised. The timeline can still be met even if the Daily Aztec publishes the ad on January 24th. A final draft timetable be distributed by the next meeting.

This survey was developed with SSRL's assistance and the assistance of a marketing expert. Deans met with their student councils to come up with college specific questions. Single campus-wide emails were sent out to all students, and based on Red Ids amended surveys were sent out with college-specific questions. Based on current survey results, 72% of students were willing to pay \$100 per semester and the percentage decreased as the fee amount went up. Ms. McNutt commented that she took this survey and considered it to be a little biased; as a student she will always want more internships, etc. The most valuable piece is the willingness of a student to pay \$100. Ms. Parker stated that the name of the survey was misleading with the name 'Student Success Fee' since everyone is aware about the excellence fee.

Mr. Grant stated that he is not comfortable with loose allocations and that student input is the biggest issue; he mentioned the problems with the IRA fee. Dr. Naughton responded that colleges that potentially vote for this fee will get an allocation based on majors and it's up to a student-faculty council how these funds will be used; there will be complete transparency. The extra funding not affecting permanent staff positions can vary year by year. The School of Engineering has already met and decided how the funds are to be distributed. Ms. Pascoe suggested implementing an application process for students and equal representation. Dr. Naughton explained that the survey was a snapshot for what improvements need to be included and what's important for each college.

Ms. Bertram asked about staff input. Ms. Ruel stated that staff input also comes from the services that are being related to in this survey; the Division of Student Affairs has not been consulted regarding this survey or its services. She expressed concern over centralized services being decentralized; i.e different sources would be more challenging to reach students. There is the International Student Center and the Leadership component that would like to be consulted about the services that are being included for evaluation. Student Affairs is worried about the duplication and decentralization. Dr. Naughton stated that it would be more economical and more efficient to add staff, space and equipment where they are needed.

Ms. McNutt expressed concern over students not being able to afford a better degree. Dr. Naughton responded that the intent is to have this fee covered by Pell Grant. She talked with students at CAL Poly and they were overwhelmingly supportive of what their excellence fee got them; they have been given a distinct advantage in their career. Ms. Ruel clarified that this is a campus based fee and won't be covered by Financial Aid, only by Pell Grant; there is no extra money coming in to cover extra mandated fees. Ms. Reilly added there will be no increased Pell because fees went up; more money will come out of the Pell Grant.

Allocations from this fee may vary by college. Mr. Mack suggested AS to meet with deans and college councils. Ms. Pascoe suggested that the college councils meet with their dean.

Ms. Ruel asked how double majors will be affected by this fee. This has not been determined yet (Dr. Singer). This fee is for undergraduate and graduate students, except for business undergraduates because they are already paying the extra fee.

The subcommittee was formed and will meet January 11th and January 13th at 2:00 pm in Kim Reilly's conference room.

Subcommittee members:

Grant Mack
Kim Reilly
Laura Schofield
Marti Ruel for Eric Rivera
Chanelle McNutt
Debra Bertram

Kevin Gruidl
Amanda Pascoe

The CFAC committee will meet January 14th once the initial referendum materials from the subcommittee are ready.

Ms. Parker made the motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Mr. Rivera. The meeting adjourned at 3:13 PM.

Reminder: Next Meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 14 at 2:00 PM in SS-1608.