

CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 11, 2021

MINUTES

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
Karina Esteban	Stephen Jackson
Amanda Fuller	

Guests:

Crystal Little	Beth Warrem
Ted Gonzalez	Matias Farre
Yesenia Acosta	Denise Lebsack

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

Review and Approval of January 28, 2022, Meeting Minutes

1. Mr. Sims asked if there were any questions for these meeting minutes. Mary Anne Kremicki stated that her comment "affects a broad range of students" got interpreted as "students abroad" in the minutes. Ms. Kremicki asked that her statement to be corrected. Mark Bruno stated his comments/questions didn't show up in the minutes. Mr. Bruno had asked about the amount being requested every semester and the process to request these funds; Ms. Kinoshita had responded that they would have to submit a proposal every time to request the total amount to fund the program. Shawki Moore motioned to approve the minutes with these edits. Ms. Kremicki seconded; the amended minutes were approved.

Mr. Sims reminded the committee that the new Student Success Fee language is saved for action and will be voted on at the February 25th CFAC meeting.

Action Items

1. ENS Course Fees

Denise Lebsack introduced two new laboratory-based course fees ENS 627L and ENS 699A. Ms. Lebsack stated the reason these are on the agenda now is because of the transition from the bachelor's program into a master's program. With that new program there is a need to establish these new course fees. These fees will be used to order some expendable supplies for students such as athletic tape and some equipment that students can use for their whole two years in the program; the stethoscope is an example of this equipment. Most of these are personal items not commonly shared.

Ms. Little pointed out they are not asking for the lab fee to cover the full cost of the supplies. The department is still absorbing some of the cost and only passing a portion of the cost on to the students.

Ms. Tejada asked if there were any courses right now that currently have a course fee within the ENS department and asked to better see the justification on the screen. Ms. Lebsack responded that this program is the Master's of Science in Athletic Training that resides within the ENS department, so it's a program independent on its own. The current lab fees in the ENS 389A course are going away because the bachelor's program is not going to be offered anymore. ENS 265 Lab has a lab fee, but that's not a course in this curriculum, it's a separate undergrad course.

Ms. Schenkenfelder asked for clarification on the Bachelor's program is not going to be offered any more, and if so when did that happen. She stated that it is surprising because that's an incredibly popular program that a lot of students come to SDSU for. Ms. Lebsack responded that eliminating the B.S. in Athletic Training has been in the works for several years now. They are currently graduating the last bachelor's class in May and the first master's class is also starting in May. It's been noted in the catalog. Additionally, it's a new nationwide mandate that the new entry-level into the program is going to be at the master's level.

Ms. Schenkenfelder stated that she noticed the trend of a lot of these different fees are coming to CFAC as action items without coming as information first, which doesn't seem appropriate. It doesn't really give CFAC a lot of time to discuss or think about in advance of taking an action. Within Associated Students, items are brought as information prior to action, so there is time to discuss, and then this item is brought as action at the subsequent meeting. If there's an opportunity to have items come to CFAC as information first to provide time to discuss and then act at the following meeting it would be really helpful. Ms. Little responded that historically these types of requests have been information and then moved to action at the following meeting. Sometimes due to the timing and urgency of a request, it may be an action item. If the committee is not comfortable voting on this item today, action for this item can be postponed to the meeting on the 25th. We appreciate the feedback and will be diligent as we move forward to do our best to bring items as information and then to action for the following meeting.

Ms. Schenkenfelder asked about the process to determine a student fee versus the department absorbing the whole fee. Ms. Lebsack responded that these fees were established in the undergrad program, so it was the natural progression to get approval for the master's program. Essentially the 689A course is the equivalent of what used to be the 389A course, so we're just transferring that lab fee over. The 627 lab fee is a new course added to the curriculum in order to prepare the students adequately to be able to do these skills. There's a lot of equipment that the students are actually going to be able to take home with them or keep with them, like the stethoscope, the scissors and some of the items that are meant to stay with them to practice at home. This facilitates students having access to these supplies.

Ms. Schenkenfelder stated she was fine with voting on the action today and her recommendation is for items to be presented as information first moving forward.

Mr. Fitch stated that speaking from an idea of giving the students the freedom of choosing a cheaper option, so they can purchase the materials needed for class. He asked if the department explored the idea of making these fees an optional fee, not a mandatory fee. Ms. Lebsack responded that in order for students to function in the lab they need to have the supplies, so nothing here would be optional. These are necessary supplies in order to practice the skill set that they're going to need to be athletic trainers.

Ms. Schenkenfelder added within all stem classes all lab fees are usually mandatory to cover any chemicals or any lab equipment that students utilize.

Ms. Tejada asked about the alternative if this fee didn't exist. Ms. Lebsack responded that these are necessary items to have when doing the clinical rotation settings, so the students would have to purchase these items on their own and others the departments would have to absorb. Ms. Little added that the advantage of having the department purchase materials is that it allows the department to make bulk purchases, which reduces the cost versus each student purchasing these individually.

Mr. Moore commented that this is a necessary fee, comparable to having to buy a book and necessary materials. If this is a required fee, it would get factored into the financial aid, so it is good to move forward with approving this.

Mr. Bruno commented on the rules for the lab fees; students are supposed to be given the option to pay these fees or not. Ms. Little agreed that course fees are not mandatory fees; these are category III fees, which are required and associated with a course. There is some language where students are able to acquire the necessary materials and services through another means they can do some, but if there are

materials they can't acquire they have to pay the fees. It is more advantageous for students to go through the course fees.

Mr. Fitch asked about assistance for students who don't have financial aid. Ms. Lebsack is not aware of any student assistance, but buying these items in bulk is cheaper than buying these individually. Ms. Schenkenfelder added that there are options; ECRT has sponsored students in the past and the College of Science has also helped students.

Ms. Tejada called this action to question and Mr. Moore seconded.

CFAC voted and the ENS course fee was approved unanimously.

2. Alternative Consultation – Pro/Con Statements

Ms. Little updated the committee regarding the final information pamphlet for the alternative consultation process for the Accelerated Tech and Sustainability fee. Part of the process was soliciting Pro and Con statements, which were received and presented to the subcommittee. The subcommittee reviewed and selected the Pro and Con statements to be included in the information pamphlet. Each student selected had the opportunity to submit a rebuttal to the alternative statement. The pro and con statements and rebuttals were shared for review to the full committee. She invited anyone from the subcommittee to speak. Ms. Tejada commented that the selected statements were the strongest statements reviewed by the subcommittee. Ms. Little asked about any factual or grammatical edits while there is still time to reach out to the students.

Mr. Fitch asked about the number of pro/con statements; Ms. Little responded that 21 statements were received.

Mr. Sims asked the committee to vote. The final information pamphlet inclusive of the pro and con statements was approved unanimously.

Mr. Sims asked for any public comments.

Ms. Little reminded the committee that forums start on Monday and encouraged CFAC members to attend at least one forum over the next 3 weeks to hear what the students have to say in person. The open forums are listed on the CFAC web page and on <https://bfa.sdsu.edu/financial/budget/spring2022alternativeconsultation> There are also A-frames around campus with a scannable code and the open forums will be published on the Daily Aztec on Wednesday.

Ms. Tejada asked about another Canvas pop up; Ms. Little responded that it is due to be out next week for a week. There will also be a text message link to students, as well as social media outreach using Facebook, Tweeter and emails to reach as many students as possible.

Mr. Moore asked if the CFAC student members are able to vote. Ms. Little responded that CFAC student members are still students and are eligible to vote, so they will be provided with a feedback form to cast their vote at the open forums.

Ms. Schenkenfelder asked if the alternative consultation and open forum information could be brought to the front of the main BFA and CFAC web site to be more accessible to students, since students are not familiar with the CFAC web site. Ms. Little responded that Ted can take care of bringing the information to the front of the CFAC page and can talk to the web site team to see if it is possible to include this information on the main BFA site.

Mr. Fitch asked about the process to review the feedback forms. Ms. Little responded that at the March 11th meeting CFAC will be provided with a tally and consolidation of the feedback forms; this is an open meeting and the plan will be to meet and discuss in person, likely in Montezuma Hall with room for general comment. Mr. Fitch also asked if it was possible to sort out the forum feedback forms between

SDSU main campus and IV campus. Ms. Little responded that CFAC represents SDSU and committee members represent the whole student body. It would not be appropriate to segregate the feedback because the committee is tasked to make a recommendation for all SDSU students, not by campus location, but in totality.

Ms. Oduro asked if there is an update in terms of student organizations reaching out to have an alternative consultation presentation at their meetings. Ms. Little responded yes and the open forum schedule provides the date, time, location and whether it is hosted or not. There was significant outreach to student organizations over the last 3-4 weeks to try and get them to engage in hosting an open forum. Students still have the option to reach out to CFAC to host additional forums.

Mr. Sims motioned to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Moore seconded.

This meeting adjourned at 11:42am.

Requests

- a. None

New Business

- a. None

Public Comment

Reminder: Next meeting is scheduled for Friday, February 25th, at 11:00 A.M. via Zoom.