

## CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 28, 2022

### MINUTES Amended 2/11/22

#### ATTENDEES

##### Members:

Ashley Tejada	Alexia Oduro
David Ely	Austin Barber
Mary Anne Kremicki	Carlos Fitch
Rashmi Praba	Shawki Moore
T'Ante Sims	Jennifer Schenkenfelder
Mikhail Portnoy	Mark Bruno
Savanna Schuermann	Karina Esteban
Stephen Jackson	

##### Guests:

Crystal Little	Eric Hansen
Jerry Sheehan	Mark Reed
Beth Warrem	Jessica Byrnes-Fox
Ted Gonzalez	Alicia Kinoshita
Matias Farre	Katie Dennison
Maribel Madero	Christy Samarkos
Gener Abdon	James Frazee
Yesenia Acosta	

The meeting was called to order 11:01 A.M. by T'Ante Sims, CFAC Chair.

#### **Review and Approval of December 17, 2021, Meeting Minutes**

- a. Mr. Sims asked if there were any questions for these meeting minutes. There were none. He motioned to approve the minutes and Ms. Kremicki seconded. The meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

#### **Action Items**

##### **a. Student Success Fee Updated Policy Language**

Current language: No SDSU faculty, staff or students are permitted to be paid as guest/special lecturers or otherwise using SSF/ARP funds, with the exception of student travel reimbursement.  
Proposed language: No SDSU faculty staff or students are permitted to be paid as guest/special lecturers or otherwise using SSF/ARP funds, with the exception of student travel reimbursement *and paid faculty-led student research projects. Student Research: Students may be paid as student assistants to work on faculty-led student research projects.*

Ms. Kinoshita, Director for Undergraduate Student Research and Creative Activities presented the proposed language change; the purpose is to allow faculty-led student research projects. In 2021 a one-time allocation was requested and granted to support student-based research opportunities with a faculty mentor. There was a high demand for this program, with applications from 72 teams of 2-3 students, but the program was only able to fund 41 of the applicants. This program was administered by the Division of Student Affairs and Campus Diversity in partnership with the Division of Research and Innovation. There is currently no base funding to support the increased demand for student involvement in these research activities, so a policy change would help respond to the demand from students and expand the program, so that it is not just over the summer, but summer plus fall or spring and summer. She gave an overview of the student impact and offered testimonials from students who have benefitted from this opportunity.

Ms. Little clarified that this is just a request to change the policy language to allow for this type of activity to be submitted through the Student Success fee process and not a request to provide resources.

Ms. Dennison, SDSU alumna in Child Development, was part of the program that offered the hands-on research opportunity, which has been valuable beyond the classroom experience; she hopes this continues to be an opportunity to other students in the future. She is currently applying to medical school.

Ms. Byrnes-Fox also took advantage of the one-time funding last spring. She is currently a second-year graduate student in the department of Child and Family Development. She got to see how the research started and learned all the steps, including survey setup. She is currently working on analyzing the data collected and this experience has helped her better define the direction she wants to go.

Ms. Schenkenfelder asked Ms. Praba if she could provide how much funding went to research and other projects this past Student Success Fee cycle. Ms. Praba responded that she has discussed this with Luke and this information will be provided within the week.

Ms. Schenkenfelder asked Ms. Kinoshita about form of payment for applicants, i.e. stipend or hourly wage; Ms. Kinoshita responded that it was an hourly wage between \$17-\$20 an hour with faculty helping students build their budget. The process will be similar to the spring emergency funding, which was \$330,000.

Ms. Kremicki asked if there has been any discussion regarding a limited percentage dedicated towards this type of activity, since the Student Success Fee has typically benefitted a broad number of students and the use of guest speakers. Ms. Kinoshita responded that she understands this is a temporary fix until the program can become more sustaining.

Mr. Bruno asked about the amount requested every semester and the process to request these funds. Ms. Kinoshita responded that they would have to submit a proposal every time to request the total amount to fund the program. Ms. Little confirmed that this request would go through the current Student Success Fee proposal process.

Mr. Moore expressed concern over setting up a precedent to pay students with other students' money and that it was used last year on a temporary basis. Another concern is that paying students might take opportunities away from others who don't get paid. Ms. Kinoshita responded that students are working towards initiatives, research endeavors and creative activities.

Mr. Jackson asked if the funding is also going to be utilized towards research projects, or just student wages. Ms. Kinoshita confirmed that this would just be for student wages towards research projects. In this case the faculty have their own project funding, but are employing students to assist with these projects. During the summer there is funding of \$220,000 as incentive for students to participate in these projects.

Ms. Tejada asked about the cycle transition. Ms. Praba explained that the two cycles are part of a 2-year pilot program; historically students have applied for Student Success Fee dollars in the fall semester, with funds awarded in the spring semester, with the expectation that they spend these funds by the end of spring. There is now a spring cycle pilot where students will have a full academic year to spend these funds with the final report also due at the end of May. Ms. Tejada expressed concern over adding another variable with the change of application volume.

Ms. Schenkenfelder motioned to table this action item due to the possible impact on the Student Success Fee program; Mr. Fitch seconded the motion. The CFAC committee voted with 7 in favor and 7 against the motion. Mr. Sims broke the tie in favor of tabling this item until the next CFAC meeting.

#### **b. Alternative Consultation – Presentation**

Mr. Sheehan provided the open forum presentation for Accelerating Tech and Sustainability Fee. He shared a video with the process overview of the fee proposal and alternative consultation for this fee. Feedback will be collected from students at the open forums. He presented the proposed fee levels per semester based on 3 essential needs: reliable connectivity, hardware/software for coursework and

troubleshooting and technical support. This includes an increased number of electronics for loan. In terms of IT support to student ratio SDSU is currently the worst compared to other similar research 1 institutions. This means students have less device access and wait longer for support. Currently there is no e-waste recycling. There is increased interest in efficient printing and the use of recycled materials.

Dr. Hansen continued the open forum presentation. He shared some student survey quotes, testimonials and student survey results.

Mr. Sheehan transitioned to the feedback form overview. Ms. Schuermann asked why the 1-hour response time? Students have classes and asked if it's possible to allow for more time. Ms. Little responded that historically students have not had an hour to complete the feedback form; there forms are returned right at the end of the presentation. Students may also have the option to watch a video of the open forum presentation at their convenience and submit the feedback form then.

Mr. Moore commented that the climate strike slide does not specify that the climate strikes are not in direct correlation with this fee. Dr. Hansen responded that this is just to articulate demands and this will be re-emphasized at the end of the presentation.

Mr. Fitch asked about translating the presentation to Spanish. Ms. Little responded that CFAC can provide a written translation of the script.

The CFAC committee moved to vote for the alternative consultation presentation. 13 members voted in favor, 2 against and 1 abstained. The presentation was approved, inclusive of the feedback from.

Mr. T'Ante mentioned the information pamphlet approved before the break with 13 votes in favor, 2 opposed and 1 abstention. He asked for questions/comments, but there were none.

There are no new items, no new requests or public comment.

Mr. Sims motioned to adjourn the meeting; the meeting was adjourned at 12:03 P.M.

**Reminder:** Next meeting is scheduled for Friday, February 11<sup>th</sup>, at 11:00 A.M. via Zoom.