

CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

March 11, 2022

MINUTES

ATTENDEES

Members:

Ashley Tejada	Alexia Oduro
David Ely	Austin Barber
Mary Anne Kremicki	Carlos Fitch
Rashmi Praba	Shawki Moore
T'Ante Sims	Mark Bruno
Erika Gutierrez	Mark Reed
Karina Esteban	Savanna Schuermann
Amanda Fuller	Aly Moore – sub for Stephen Jackson
Jennifer Schenkenfelder	

Non-Voting Members: Crystal Little

Guests: Approximately 35-40 attendees in-person and via zoom

The meeting was called to order 9:03 A.M. by T'Ante Sims, CFAC Chair.

Review and Approval of February 25, 2022, Meeting Minutes

Mr. Sims asked for comments, discussion or feedback on the minutes. Ms. Kremicki noted that Mr. Portnoy should be listed as guest, and not a member when she is in attendance. The minutes will be revised to note this. Ms. Tejada motioned to approve the minutes and Mr. Moore seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Informational Items

a. Accelerating Tech and Sustainability Fee Alternative Consultation feedback (Attachment 2)

Ms. Little thanked the students who participated in the alternative consultation process and acknowledged the thoughtful dialog during the open forums that were held from February 14th through March 4th. After the 20-30 min presentations students filled out feedback forms and selected one of 4 options:

Option 1, \$249 fee: 20 students in support
Option 2, \$199 fee: 44 students in support
Option 3, \$174 fee: 127 students in support
Option 4, No fee: 320 students in support

There were 615 attendees and 511 feedback forms received; submitted feedback were validated to ensure that only eligible student feedback was included in this process. Overall, there was 37.4% support of the fee across all the fee options and 62.6% of the feedback was for the no fee option. The feedback also includes qualitative comments which were shared with the committee for consideration.

b. 30-minute open comment period – guests must sign up to speak at check-in and are allotted 1 minute to speak

- Donna Ross, faculty and senate member: voiced her concern if this fee doesn't pass because this means the 24-hour support will go away. Also, it's hard to talk to people about climate change because they don't want to make changes now for the future.
- Sean Hauze: Had the opportunity to participate in a dozen open forums and heard students overwhelmingly see the need to support technology and sustainability, with different opinions on how it should be done. Smart phones are an example of costly technology that later became a necessity. Technology ages, so there is a need for bigger investments to keep it up to date.
- Jessica Barlow, faculty involved in sustainability efforts: Still behind peer institutions when it comes to available resources to invest in sustainability, reducing carbon footprint from the Cogen plant

and commuter traffic; this proposed fee will allow students to co-invest in renewable energy and greater subsidy for a mass transient pass.

- Daryn Ockey, Exec. Director of Facility Services: There is no funding to teach students about sustainability.
- Aurora Velasco, Learning Environments Manager: Staff and student assistant support will be reduced without this fee and an evening position will be lost.
- Chris Potente, staff technician: Concerned about loss of technology to record lectures; evening tech support will be lost.
- Stephanie Amaya: Not fair that university is raising fees when they were already raised last semester.
- Chantay Taylor, daily commuter since freshman year 2018: The sustainability fee will help reduce carbon footprint. Alternative transportation would be helpful.
- Ethan Garcia, graduate student who also completed undergraduate degree at SDSU: Has seen technology grow from something that would be nice to have to an essential need. Zoom, Creative Cloud, Canvas and recorded lectures were not around when he started his undergraduate degree here and hopes the fee passes to help students be successful 8 years from now.
- Rudy Arias, Assoc. Director for ITS: Every year is a struggle to find resources; there is a process to identify the rooms that need to be upgraded, but no funding.
- Michelle Pederson, Learning Technologies Manager: SDSU needs to invest in modern and new technology to allow faculty and staff to continually innovate and focus on what's important. Scantron forms and clickers can cause students stress if they don't have the proper tool.
- Manuel Piña, student and part-time worker at the IV campus: The benefits from this fee won't be significant for the IV campus.
- James Frazee, Chief Academic Technology Officer: Job includes scanning the horizon to see what's coming next to help student be competitive in the market place and to be competitive there needs to be an investment in new technologies.
- Elisa Mendez-Pintado, Co Vice Chair for M.E.Ch.A at SDSU: Here to uplift the voices of underrepresented students; this fee creates a financial strain and doesn't have to be on the backs of students.
- Eliana Allize, Chair for M.E.Ch.A. at SDSU: Concerned about impact on students; fees will continue to increase without student knowledge. Underrepresented students should not pay for this increase because it seems more of a luxury for innovation instead of what students are actually going through.
- Celina Ibarra: Attended several forums and was disturbed by lack of transparency; questions were not answered and there were too many discrepancies during the open forums.
- Jerry Sheehan, Chief Information Officer for SDSU: This is a question about the past being good enough for the future. In the past we subsidized what we could give students in terms of equipment; presently with federal funds that expire in May we can provide solutions. Without the fee in the future that doesn't exist. In the past our ratios are 1 to 200, lowest to meet student needs; presently there are no funds to address this and, in the future, won't be able to grow. IV only has 5 staff to meet all the IT needs for the campus; presently we can't do anything without a partnership with our students. The fee is important for who we can become, versus who we were.
- Robert Zepeda, 2nd semester student at SDSU: Formerly incarcerated, speaking autonomously, made the Dean's List last semester, print base type of guy who is taking a chance on education to turn his life around. Speaking on experience being formerly incarcerated and struggling with technology, but still being able to push through. He represents the experience of not having much and barely getting by, so an additional fee to tuition would be bad because he constantly has to struggle to see where his next meal is going to come from. It is important that this fee is not included, as it will be an additional burden to students who want to learn and grow.
- Maricruz Carrillo: Student over 10 years who has been through 4 student fee increases and is saddened to be here once again. She asked to analyze the system that we have created where a student fee is the only option; there is a better way to do it, but it hasn't been done. Say no to this fee because we can't bear it anymore and analyze the system where it only ends up being a student fee. She asked for students to be considered.

CFAC discussion ensued:

Ms. Praba commented that she's worked on this campus over 20 years and one of the things she enjoys most is the opportunity to work with students and build relationships with students and continues to be impressed with the thoughtfulness that our students bring to conversations, including throughout this process and the forum she attended. That thoughtfulness was apparent through the qualitative statements on the feedback forms. She read the statements and while there was concern over the financial burden of this fee, there was also the recognition that there are benefits to the implementation of this fee, like continued Canvas support, investment in technology and sustainability.

Ms. Oduro first thanked everyone for coming and sharing. From an ethical standpoint, the open forum presentation to students is not what was approved by CFAC. Secondly, the fact that the presentations were changed from forum to forum is not fair for the committee to look at the data and think it is fair when each student got a different presentation; this impacts the data. She asked the committee to focus on student voices through the data, with a clear no to this fee.

Ms. Tejada expressed appreciation for the university staff coming and their sentiments, but reminded CFAC that it is students paying this fee and the ones directly impacted by this fee, so other comments should not be considered a priority in this discussion. The presentations were different and it was verified that at one point the presenters had to be reminded to be consistent. Even with inconsistencies the data still shows that the student body does not want it. There is a need to recognize how we are attending and serving the students of color; in the current climate students of color don't feel welcome and supported. M.E.Ch.A. SDSU for example, traditionally underrepresented and marginalized made it known that their community would be significantly impacted. There was not a student voice at Imperial Valley, that is because it is a privilege to attend an open forum, it is a privilege to miss class, it is a privilege to miss a job to make it to the scheduled open forums. Historically underrepresented students in marginalized communities don't have the privilege to spend 40 minutes to an hour of their day to make their voice heard, so encouraged the committee to heavily consider this.

Mr. Fitch thanked all for their valuable time and echoed the same concern that this fee is to be paid by students and not staff. He quoted some specific phrases from the student comments he read: "empty promises", "ridiculous", "slap on the face", "going somewhere else." He asked to focus on why more students are not here; students are at a disadvantage, but their voices matter.

Mr. Moore commented that even though a lot of students perceived that without this fee Canvas will go away, still over 60% of these students don't support this fee.

Ms. Little attended all 39 open forums and responded to the comments about content and inconsistency of the presentations. There wasn't a script, but she believes there was integrity in the content; different words may have been used by the presenters throughout the process and presenters were scaled back when the presentation became a bit lengthy. She wants to ensure the community that there was no change in the overall content in the presentation, even when different words may have been used and words may have been heard differently by different students. There was no lack of integrity in the presentation from what was presented to the Campus Fee Advisory Committee for approval.

Ms. Schenkenfelder said that as Vice President of University Affairs for Associated Students, her role is to work with faculty and administration regarding academic policy, and one thing they look at very frequently is academic freedom. A public comment today went as far as to bring a clicker and a scantron and wants to assure the community that regardless of what fee goes through, academic freedom prohibits the university from telling faculty how they are able to measure the academic success of students. Even if the fee was implemented and they provided this obscure modern technology that faculty could use to take attendance or participation, there is no guarantee that it can be utilized. This is again a tactic of manipulation that has been utilized frequently within these forums. Additionally, she believes there was a lack of integrity within these presentations, since students of color were told that Canvas will go away without this fee; the words that were utilized were manipulative. As someone who has worked directly with students in Project Rebound, she is sorry the university is failing them by requiring them to pay for something that should be

there without asking. Other universities have implemented ways to improve technology without resorting to student fees. It is not the students' fault for being so far behind technology, it is the university's fault for not investing properly.

Ms. Moore, sitting for Stephen Jackson, introduced herself as the Associated Students Sustainability Representative. She commented that the clicker and scantron was a big point she heard at a lot of presentations she attended and it would be more stressful to pay for this fee than remembering to bring a scantron. She wants to touch on how many people got and understood the information regarding the open forums, since a lot of students went through the Canvas pop up just to get to their classwork. There is not enough feedback from students, but the feedback received shows a clear answer of what the students want in the short amount of time this was pushed through. A letter was sent to Adela with climate justice demands in spring 2021; this letter explicitly talks about strategic planning activities 15-17 and asked to not use student fees for sustainability initiatives. Many students' main concern when getting higher education is how to pay for it. These students are not just facing financial crisis, but also different forms of racism, and discrimination on campus and in their classroom by not getting their voices heard. She knows someone who was passionate about the 8 points that were brought up by the climate strike; these points were used in the presentation without asking for permission; she thinks it is ridiculous that students have to address 4 points that the university brought up in its climate action plan; it is not the students' fault the university has not made enough movement on their promises. She asked the committee to consider the livability of this campus. She understands technology is a big part of this and sustainability is only roughly 30% of this fee, even though it is regarded as much as technology. Without a livable future on this campus students won't be able to learn in proper environments and it is not the students' burden to make this happen.

Ms. Schuermann brought up some concerns: 1. The goals of objectivity and transparency in the alternative consultations process were not met; some of the data that was used was not collected in the context of the fee, but it was taken from different surveys, different populations and different time periods, including the climate strike letter demands taken from different contexts and then used to say students are supporting this. Asking students what they need versus asking them to pay for something are two different questions. 2. Virtual reality was brought up to introduce people to Kumeyaay ways of life, which is really problematic if not done in concert with Kumeyaay, especially given that some senators just voted to rescind the land acknowledgement or the requirement for it. 3. A lot of the initiatives outlined in the proposal don't seem to address student fees. In terms of the ecologic impact proposal, like recycling paper is already a California state law, so there are no innovative solutions and true sustainable solutions need to focus on the systemic level, not the individuals. Subsidies for mass transit get sustainable solutions, but not if the students are funding it. Sustainability is an ecological and a social concept; asking the poorest, most marginalized and vulnerable in the community to fund what will benefit many is not what sustainability means.

Ms. Kremicki said that she is sensitive to what she is hearing, but the CSU is not funded to make some of these changes as quickly as necessary. This fee may be the most practical way to effect change more quickly.

Dr. Ely recognized the two streams of thought; one being the economic situation of students enduring high inflation, gas prices and cost of living. The other being that technology changes dramatically and there is a need to keep current with technology and to provide students with required experience and expertise in the use of technology when they go out into the field. His college is accredited and goes through a review period every 5 years and according to accreditation standards there is a standard that requires students to have an expertise in technology; this is required of all accounting students. It is important to provide and use current technology on campus and has to be concerned that we don't keep pace to that. Technology for virtual learning is very fragile, so technical support is critical.

Mr. Reed expressed concern about resources to help students be successful. He works in the Division of Research and Innovation. and wants to make sure students have the ability to engage in cutting edge research that many times involves this kind of technology and sees the fee as a reliable and sustainable way to fund this.

Ms. Esteban re-emphasized the financial burden to students, especially those who worry about the next meal and other basic needs. Students are not able to be successful if they can't fund their basic resources to be successful. Students shouldn't have to decide whether to pay for technology, which is a privilege or where the next meal is going to come from.

Ms. Schenkenfelder commented that the goal of the CSU is to serve the non-traditional students and we need to ensure we are not just aligning with other universities, but the mission of the CSU, which is to serve our non-traditional students. As someone who is within the College of Sciences, it is not that we don't care about technology, but to throw this on the backs of students is the prime issue here. When the university received funding from the government, HEERF funding was used to improve IT finances and technology, but the disparity from these funds going away is not the students' fault; it is the fault of the university.

Mr. Moore commented that not all majors require the same level of technology and reminded this committee that the goal of CFAC is to review the student feedback and vote on student feedback. 320 students do not support the fee and only 511 students gave feedback; it is clearly a no for this fee.

Mr. Fitch commented in Spanish on the lack of linguistic accessibility and promised to continue to ask for this.

Mr. Sims reminded the committee that there is a 3% return to aid on this fee. He works with the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships, the Economic Crisis Response Team to address food insecurity and any type of issues students have and they try to help students no matter what.

Action Item: Accelerating Tech and Sustainability Fee recommendation to President de la Torre

Mr. Moore made the motion to not recommend this fee for approval; Ms. Oduro seconded.

Roll call:
Bruno-yea
David-nay
Amanda-yea
Mary Anne-nay
Rashmi-nay
Mark-nay
Savanna-yea
Austin-yea
Karina-yea
Carlos-yea
Erika-yea
Aly-yea
Shawki-yea
Alexia-yea
Jennifer-yea
Ashley-yea

The committee voted to not recommend approval of the Accelerating Tech and Sustainability Fee to President de la Torre with 12 votes in favor and 4 opposed.

Mr. Sims made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Ms. Schenkenfelder seconded; the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 am.

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