

CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 22, 2021

MINUTES

ATTENDEES

Members:

Amanda Fuller	Christian Holt
David Ely	Abi Tamayo
Mary Anne Kremicki	Armando Sepulveda
Rashmi Praba	Victor Penea
T'Ante Sims	Crystal Sanchez
Mark Bruno	Joyce Chen
Dorian Diaz del Castillo	

Guests:

Crystal Little
Matias Farre

The meeting began at 9:02 A.M. by T'Ante Sims, CFAC Chair

Review and Approval of November 20, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Sims asked if there were any discussion items on last meeting's minutes; there were none.
Mr. Sims asked if there was a motion to approve these minutes. Mr. Holt motioned to approve.
Ms. Praba second. The meeting minutes from November 20, 2020 were approved unanimously.

Informational Items

- a. None

Action Items

- a. Student Success Fee – Research-Based Opportunities for Students

Ms. Praba noted she will present these two action items on behalf of Dr. Wood who was unable to attend the meeting. She stated that this first request is a one-time use of \$330K of Student Success Fee (SSF) dollars to support/ enhance cocurricular activities. This is a collaboration with the Division of Research and Innovation. The focus would be to utilize these one-time carryforward dollars to support student engagement in research. Ms. Praba continued and stated that the plan is to spend all these dollars on student opportunities within the Spring 2021 semester. Important to note that this is a departure from the Student Success Policy which does not allow for students to be paid. With these dollars the request is to allow paid opportunities for students. Ms. Praba then opened it up to questions.

Ms. Chen asked if this would increase any fees or will draw upon fees that have already been paid. Ms. Praba clarified that it will be from fees that have already been paid. It is a one-time ask using carryforward dollars from last fiscal year. No increase to any fees. She noted that the application process will be administered within the Division of Student Affairs and Campus Diversity in partnership with the Division of Research and Innovation. There will be student approval input through CFAC.

Dr. Ely asked for clarification on what is being voted on. If what is being voted on are the funds being used for this program or suspend the policy of not paying students.

Ms. Little clarified that the policy decision is a university decision, and the university is comfortable allowing a policy exception if CFAC supports this type of program to be approved as an appropriate use of the fees.

Dr. Ely asked how that policy was developed of not allowing SSF Funds to be used to pay students and if it was something that went through CFAC.

Ms. Little responded saying CFAC does not develop policies as that is not within the charge of the committee. The policy, based on when the SSF was implemented and the intent of the fee to support student proposals that enhanced their academic coursework, was that students paying fees to provide payments to students was not within the intent of the fee. The SSF policy was largely a BFA discussion having more to do with business side of operationalizing the fee. Ms. Little noted that they do not see this being an ongoing exception. It would be a one-time policy exception given the unique circumstances of the proposal and it would not be an ongoing exception for future use of SSF.

Dr. Ely asked if we are voting on recommending to someone to suspend that policy or if CFAC is voting on allowing this policy exception.

Ms. Little stated it is a university business decision on whether to allow the policy exception as CFAC does not have a role in setting university policy. BFA is supportive of and has the authority to make the policy exception should CFAC be supportive of the proposal. If CFAC supports this proposal for the use of SSF, then BFA will move forward with the policy exception. Ultimately, CFAC is voting on whether or not they support this proposal for use of SSF carry-forward funds.

Ms. Chen asked if the \$330K has been allocated to other things in the past, will this proposal take away from the possibilities of other things being funded, or is the money just sitting there waiting to be used.

Ms. Praba explained that these funds are carryforward dollars from previous years. They have not been allocated to anything else yet. Ms. Chen followed up asking how much money would be left if this was approved. Ms. Praba answered that it would be approximately \$800K. Ms. Little asked if that is still the approximate amount after the Spring proposals. Ms. Praba confirmed it is.

Mr. Penner asked if in previous years had there been a policy of what SSF rollover funds are used for or does it go back into the same bucket of money and depending on the situation, such as our current unique situation with COVID, decisions are made. Ms. Little responded that this is the first time a proposal has come outside the SSF process that has been in practice since the implementation of the fee.

Generally, there is a proposal process, that CFAC went through in the Fall, that came to CFAC for approval. Prior to it coming to CFAC it had gone through different levels of review and approval making sure there was support for the proposals. She continued that given the current COVID situation, the proposals that were approved for last Spring could not move forward as they were intended. This produced some carryforward funds, which was made available for the Fall process. However, since we are currently still in a COVID situation, the proposals did not need as much funding or were unable to move forward. Ms. Little noted that once the proposal process happens, the proposals occur, and the funds are expended. If the funds are not expended from the proposals that were approved, then those funds stay in an account designated specifically for the SSF program and then that process repeats again in its current state every Fall. Ms. Little continued that there are discussions that may change in the future, but this is the current process.

Mr. Penner voiced that the reason we could fund the proposals in the Fall is because we had that rollover cushion and that a big concern is if we deplete what is leftover now, then there will not be enough funding for other proposals that may come up in the Fall. Mr. Bruno voiced that it could create precedence for future situations. This proposal could take away funding for other activities. Ms. Praba noted that this proposal is still in line with the intent of the SSF, promoting and enhancing cocurricular opportunities for the students.

Mr. Holt voiced that every year College of Engineering gets funding from the SSF and that this proposal is not different from that. This proposal would give students jobs during this pandemic, however voiced concerns of not setting precedent moving forward. Mr. Holt then asked what the typical carryforward is each year to see if there is a possibility of this happening again in future years.

Ms. Little added that, the carryforward is minimal because there are usually more proposals than there are funds to support them. These funds are expected to be fully utilized. The COVID situation has created this unique opportunity to use these funds for other things and Ms. Little does not see this being an ongoing opportunity in the future. Mr. Holt added that even if this proposal does not get passed, there will always be a shortfall in the future as the funds from this fee will continue to be spent. This proposal would support students through a pandemic by providing jobs and research opportunity.

Mr. Penner asked if the proposal were approved today, would it give the Division of Student Affairs and Campus Diversity rights to approve requests like this without consulting CFAC.

Ms. Little answered that the policy for the SSF and how that fee was approved requires the use of those funds to come through CFAC.

Mr. Sims asked if there are any further discussion on action item A.

Mr. Holt commented that he does support this proposal, however, he would like to know where the money gets directly allocated and if this would go towards the student's pay for research opportunities. Ms. Praba stated that to her understanding these funds would go toward to support paid research internships or opportunities for students in addition to programming and other operating type expenses.

Dr. Ely asked that before voting we should know exactly what is being voting on. Ms. Little answered that from her perspective, the committee is voting on allocating approximately \$330K from the SSF carryforward fund to be available for an application process, awarded to students, to support their research and internship opportunities. She continued that once that proposal process concludes it would come back to CFAC for final review and approval of the awards to students. As for the policy exception, that is a policy decision that happens behind the scenes if CFAC approves. So CFAC is voting to approve that the approximately \$330K be allocated to funding students' research opportunities.

Mr. Bruno voiced that this is to make sure that they are being transparent. Ms. Little stated that yes, because this type of program does allow payments to students whereas the original policy of the SSF does not allow this. BFA is agreeable to allowing a one-time exception to this policy if there is committee support for this proposal.

Ms. Chen asked if there is a way to know how long these funds could last or is this just for the upcoming Spring and possibly Fall semester. Ms. Praba answered that the plan is to utilize all the funds in the Spring semester. Mr. Holt added that we are voting on this because CFAC is that body that votes on things regarding SSF. They are also letting CFAC know that students are being paid because in SSF allocations, we do not pay students. Mr. Holt agreed with the proposal because it would benefit students especially since a lot of on campus jobs were cut due to the pandemic. He added that every year they fund students for volunteer projects, where this would allow for them to be paid.

Ms. Chen added that she agrees with wanting to fund student's research projects but does not agree with student fees funding this. Though this is a one-time occurrence, Ms. Chen does not want this to be something that will be relied on in the future where it appeared that the students are paying themselves since they are the ones paying this fee. Mr. Holt agreed that students should not have to pay for resources, but he noted that he does not see this much money being available to students in the future and this is a good opportunity for students especially during a pandemic. Ms. Little provided clarification on the payment to students that this is a one-time exception due to the uniqueness of the situation with COVID. If we were in a normal budget situation absent COVID, this would not be the resource they would rely on for this proposal.

Dr. Ely asked if there was an estimate of how many students, they think they would be able to help, how many projects could this fund, is there a timeline and if there is confidence that this program can be implemented given, we are already in the Spring semester. Ms. Praba stated that Dr. Wood is confident that the money and the process can be allocated to students this semester. She does not have specific numbers on what the anticipated number of projects or students this proposal would be able to help but can follow up with the group with more information.

Mr. Sims asked if there are any remaining comments or questions; there were none.

Mr. Sims asked if there is any motion to approve item A under the action items. Ms. Fuller motioned to approve item A. Mr. Penner second.

Mr. Sims asked for votes on approving item A. 2 Nays, 2 Abstain, and 9 Yes.

Action item A was approved by majority vote.

b. Student Success Fee – Technological Support for Zoom Housing

Ms. Praba introduced the second proposal and stated that this is about the impact COVID has had to our technology services on campus. The COVID health and safety regulations has required most of our academic programming and coursework to go virtual. Same is true for Student Success Fee (SSF) programs and proposals that students put forth. She noted that one of the requirements was that any events proposed through SSF must be able to be achieved virtually. There were 93 proposals and 85 were approved. Ms Praba continued that there has been a heavy reliance on the University's technology services. The request here is for an allocation of \$30K to help provide additional resources so SSF programming can have the Zoom and other technology support. Ms. Praba noted that the intent of the \$30K is to be able to pay overtime to employees who provide this support and bring on hourly and/or temporary employees if needed. Any funding that is leftover would return to the SSF pool.

Mr. Sims opened it up for discussion. Mr. Bruno asked if the \$30K is being distributed across the various proposals as some proposals are not in need of Zoom resources. Ms. Praba responded that this proposal would not allocate funds specifically to student proposals. It would provide an allocation of funds to the University's IT division to be able to make resources available to students who are putting on virtual events and need Zoom or other technological support.

Mr. Penera asked if this proposal would cover labor costs under the IT department. Ms. Praba responded that this is correct. Mr. Penera asked why this came to CFAC versus a different committee, such as PBAC as this is going to be covering staffing. Ms. Praba noted that because this is proposal is requesting to use SSF dollars to support SSF virtual programming. Mr. Penera voiced that using "programming" is misleading as it sounds like this would have gone to cover more events rather than labor costs. Ms. Praba noted that this would go towards covering the costs of providing support in the virtual environment to SSF Programs. At this point, as SSF programs are going online, if they need technological support, they go to the University's IT. She noted that because resources are stretched thin with majority of coursework going online, they are hitting a capacity issue in terms of how much support can be provided.

Dr. Ely asked about the accounting side of this. He then asked how expenditures are tracked in support of SSF programs and if there is an effort to do that or if this is just a general estimate of how many services are needed to request of IT teams. Ms. Praba noted that there will be specific tracking of hours and how much support is being specifically provided to SSF programs. Ms. Little added that on the accounting side, when a proposal uses space and must pay for space, this would be along the lines of a chargeback to IT support. SSF would not be directly paying for salary, it would be paying the cost recovery for the support that is being provided for IT.

Mr. Holt asked if this would normally be funded through COVID relief packages that would come from the state or federal government since this is an unforeseen expense. Ms. Praba noted she does not have the answer to this and asked Ms. Little for her input. Ms. Little responded she is unaware whether this proposal was discussed as a potential opportunity for COVID funding. She noted that this can be looked into.

Ms. Kremicki added that this is just anything that is in addition to fixed salary costs. Therefore, this would only cover an overtime situation it would not be going to any state funded salaries. Ms. Praba confirmed this is correct.

Mr. Sims asked for any further discussion. Mr. Penera motioned to table this discussion until the next meeting given the committee was only made aware off this proposal an hour prior to the meeting to provide more time for thoughts on other funding options. Mr. Sims asked if there is a motion to continue this discussion at next meeting. Ms. Tamayo motioned to continue this discussion on action item B to the next meeting. Ms. Sanchez seconds. Mr. Sims asked for a vote. 1 abstained and the rest of the committee voted yes. Motion to continue this discussion at the next meeting was approved by majority vote.

Requests

- a. None

New Business

None

Public Comment

None

Mr. Sims asked if there are any questions.

Mr. Holt requested that more information be provided on action item B at the next CFAC meeting.

Ms. Praba confirmed that this will be made possible.

Mr. Sims adjourned the meeting at 9:45 A.M

Reminder: Next meeting is scheduled for Friday, February 5, 2021 at 12:00P.M. via Zoom