

## CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 10, 2021

### MINUTES

#### ATTENDEES

Members:	Amanda Fuller	Ashley Tejada
	David Ely	Karin Esteban
	Mary Anne Kremicki	Shawki Moore
	Rashmi Praba	Austin Barber
	T'Ante Sims	Jennifer Schenkenfelder
	Mark Bruno	Stephen Jackson
	Mikhail Portnoy	Alexia Oduro
Guests:	Randall Timm	Matias Farre
	Crystal Little	Ted Gonzalez

The meeting was called to order at 11:03 A.M. by T'Ante Sims, CFAC Chair.

#### Informational Items

- a. None

#### Action Items

- a. Updated to Student Success Fee

Ms. Praba and Dr. Timm presented the proposed update to the Student Success Fee (SSF). She began by providing the history of the fee and noted that this fee is paid by the students every semester. This money is allocated for faculty lines as well as additional courses. Ms. Praba stated that the piece she and Dr. Timm will discuss is the 10% portion of the SSF that is allocated towards student related programs. Ms. Praba noted that in July 2020, the 10% piece of the SSF was transferred to Student Affairs and Campus Diversity (SACD). She continued that this fee was approved by an alternative consultation in Spring 2014 and implemented in the Fall. 90% is used for tenure-track faculty lines and additional course sections while the remaining 10% is dedicated to enhancing student success through expanded academic related programs. Ms. Praba stated that before the 10% was transferred to SACD, the respective colleges, resource managers, etc. were responsible for supporting students with spending those funds.

Ms. Praba continued the discussion and introduced the recommended process changes. Their first proposal, all awards (grant funding) is to be managed by SACD after it has been awarded to students. She noted that this is currently being done by the respective colleges. Ms. Praba states that the overall benefit of this change is students will now have one point of contact within SACD to support them. This contact will be an expert in procurement, university policies, and processes. There will also be a connection with SACD's campus partners, with access to Business and Financial Affairs to assist with the spending of these dollars. Dr. Timm added that they will be adding a student life advisor to support students who are putting together their proposals that involve events and event coordination. This will allow for students to have one point of contact who will help them understand and navigate the unique and dynamic processes that the University has. Dr. Timm continued that they are proposing there be two funding cycles (Fall/ Spring) instead of the one funding cycle we have in the Fall. He continued that the proposal will include a reduced number of review process rounds from three to two. This was a recommendation from the Assistant Deans and previous funding committees that were working on this.

Dr. Timm then stated that they are proposing that students not to be awarded more than two awards or events per academic year. This is because they saw some students winning multiple awards which then took over all their activities and in turn took away from their academics. Dr. Timm continued and proposed that IVC (Imperial Valley Campus) students be eligible for these grant awards beginning 21/22 AY.

Ms. Fuller asked if an analyst from Faculty Advancement and Student Success, who typically heled with the fiscal portion of administering this, would no longer be the point of contact and that it would be solely SACD. Ms. Praba confirmed that that is correct and added that the purpose of this is to provide efficiency. She continued that by consolidating from within SACD, that will take off some pressure on the colleges and campus partners. Ms. Fuller then asked if this prevents faculty members who mentor and assist students with their proposals and projects. Dr. Timm answered that this will not take away from those partnerships. Mr. Bruno then asked if this change is strictly for the financing part or will or will this also impact determining which projects will be awarded. Ms. Praba answered that this particular part of the proposal is to discuss the financial side, but there will be a significant amount of collaboration with the colleges. She then stated that the awards will not be determined by SACD solely.

Dr. Timm discussed the timeline and cycles. He stated that in the Fall 2021 cycle, they will facilitate a process for the 2021-22 academic year with project implementation remaining in December-May 2022. In the Spring 2022 cycle, they will facilitate a process for the 2022-23 academic year with project implementation that would run from August-May 2023. Fall 2022 cycle, they will facilitate the process for remaining funds, and project implementation would remain December-May 2023.

Ms. Little asked how they will be determine the dollar amount of projects that will be put forth in the Fall cycle versus the Spring. Currently 100% goes towards the Fall cycle, with this proposal of two cycles, how will they determine how much goes to both. Ms. Praba stated that there has not been specific conversations about how much will go towards Fall versus Spring, however, the goal is to spend all of the funds and carryforward the remaining amounts. Ms. Praba and Dr. Timm agreed that the Fall cycle would be considered primary and the Spring cycle secondary in the allocation of awards. Ms. Praba noted that the percentages will need to be worked out. Ms. Little added that this is an important consideration as historically, there are not enough funds to award to all the proposals. She continued that those that get cut off from the Fall cycle will have the opportunity to submit again for the Spring cycle, but because proposals will be turned away, they will need to have an idea of what the allocation would like. Ms. Little added that this allocation can change overtime based on experience.

Dr. Ely asked for clarification if a full academic year would be going towards Spring 2022 projects, but that in the Fall 2022, that would be when they would need to start reserving funds to award for the Spring 2023 cycle. Ms. Praba confirmed that is correct. Ms. Schenkenfelder added that there should be some transparency in this process and that students are made aware of this especially with the new two cycle format and how part of the SSF allocation will be split into these two cycles. Dr. Timm responded that they were happy to do that and suggested when the committee reviews the SSF awarded proposals that they take note of how much has been spent and the amount of rollover that could be spent in the Spring so that they can determine an allocation. He then added that if this is evaluated on an annual basis, they can see how much was spent and how much rollover they had.

Dr. Timm then showed the timeline of the overall process. Ms. Tejada then asked about the Level 2 process where Associated Students (A.S.) finalize proposal recommendations and if this process is determined by the executive officers or is there a mandated process that they need to go by. Dr. Timm

answered that from his understanding, once it went through the councils and process, it came to A.S. for their final review and approval. Ms. Little then asked if that was more consistent with the current Level 3 review where A.S. students on CFAC make the final determination that comes to CFAC for approval. Dr. Timm stated that to his understanding, this was the final approval from A.S. Ms. Little responded that historically this was the Level 3 approval which was the A.S. members of CFAC who has made the final recommendation. Ms. Tejada asked that they provide better clarification on who the approvals go through as she did not receive any proposals when she sat on the Board of Directors last year. Ms. Praba and Dr. Timm agreed that they will be able to do this. Ms. Schenkenfelder added that when she sat on the college council for the College of Sciences last year, not one proposal came through and she was unaware of who was supposed to be regulating these. Dr. Timm offered to discuss this with Ms. Schenkenfelder after the meeting in order to gain more insight on what happened last year and address it moving forward, as him and Ms. Praba were not part of the process last year.

Ms. Praba presented the review team for each funding categories. She continued that there were 3 separate funding categories and each had a dollar threshold. The first funding committee reviews up to \$7,500, the second committee \$7,501 to \$20,000, and the third committee reviews \$21,001+. Ms. Praba added that the review team has been modified to include one student from each of the colleges including IVC (this will include at least three graduate students per committee), three university representatives (one appointed by the Provost and two by the Vice President of SACD) and one CFAC moderator (non-voting member). Ms. Tejada pointed out that the retention rate for graduate student leaders is very low as they prioritize their academics. She continued that she discussed this with Dr. Wood, he agreed that they can revisit this and update it to state, up to two graduate students. Ms. Tejada asked if the verbiage can be updated from "At least three graduate students per committee" to "Up to two graduate students per committee". Ms. Praba agreed that this is doable and would make those updates to the verbiage.

Dr. Timm continued that they will be doing a series of outcomes to review and determine the impact the program has had on students' success. Dr. Ely suggested that this outcome data be separated by college as this would be very useful information for the colleges. Dr. Timm agreed and that they would provide this information. He then added that this information will be part of their final report and that their staff will be able to separate the data and provide it to each college. Ms. Fuller asked if the University had reinvested in Presence. Dr. Timm confirmed that is correct, they have about a three-year cycle with Presence. Dr. Timm continued discussing the various outcomes they will be assessing. Ms. Schenkenfelder asked if there is a process in place to collect information about the students' experience going through the process in regards to how they felt, the transparency, if they were supported by the process, etc. Dr. Timm stated that he looked to see if this was an option, but was unable to find anything, however, he would be more than happy to add that element in to include more about how their experience has been.

Ms. Praba concluded their presentation and highlighted the updates they proposed for SSF. She then opened it up for questions. Ms. Schenkenfelder asked if it was taken into consider that without the college council, critical analysis will no longer be in place and that equal representation from all colleges may be lacking as some may favor their college over others, though the hope is that they take an objective approach. Dr. Timm noted that they had worked with the Assistant Deans who were working with the college councils, and they recommended they reduce it from three to two as they believe that it was more effective and efficient with just the two rounds. Ms. Schenkenfelder suggested that as this new process is implemented, that they be open to reevaluation and adjusting especially after the first

year. Dr. Timm stated his hope is they come back every semester to voice how the program is going and provide updates.

Mr. Barber asked how much rollover from the COVID year was left to work with for the 10% spending. Ms. Praba stated that she does not have that information on hand, but offered to email out that information after the meeting. Mr. Barber followed up with that during the transition process from previous executives, they mentioned the possibility of hiring someone to help with the SSF and asked if that is still the plan. Ms. Praba confirmed that is correct. Mr. Barber then stated that on the SDSU website, it stated that 9-% goes towards faculty salary and benefits, 4% travel, training and development, 3% contractual services, and 3% supplies and services. He asked if the 4, 3, 3 percentages make up the 10% that goes towards students or if that is inclusive of the 90%. Ms. Little stated that the 90% is related to the faculty portion and the rest of it is based on the approved projects, what types of expenditures were incurring. Ms. Schenkenfelder then asked for clarification that of the projects that are approved, does this mean 4% has to be allocated towards travel. Ms. Little answered that this is just a historical representation of how the funds have been spent. Ms. Schenkenfelder stated that this can be confusing and suggested adding more context to better explain the breakdown of the 10% for transparency and understanding. Ms. Little responded that this is doable.

Mr. Sims opened it up for further comments or questions. There were none.

Mr. Sims motioned to approve the updates to the SSF process. Mr. Moore second. The SSF update proposal was approved unanimously.

#### **Requests**

- a. None

#### **New Business**

- a. None

#### **Public Comment**

- a. None

Mr. Sims motioned to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Sims adjourned the meeting at 11:45 A.M.

**Reminder:** Next meeting is scheduled for Friday, September 24<sup>th</sup>, at 11:00 A.M. via Zoom.