

## CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

October 2, 2020

### MINUTES

#### ATTENDEES

Members:	Amanda Fuller	Christian Holt
	David Ely	Isabella Martelino
	Mary Anne Kremicki	Armando Sepulveda
	Rashmi Praba	Victor Penera
	T'Ante Sims	Crystal Sanchez
	Mark Bruno	Joyce Chen
	Dorian Diaz del Castillo	Abi Tamayo
Non-voting Members:	Dana Smith	
Guests:	Stephanie Anderson	Beth Warrem
	Andrea Dooley	Crystal Little
	Philip Greiner	Matias Farre
	Luke Wood	

The meeting was called to order at 12:02 P.M. by T'Ante Sims, CFAC Chair.

#### **Review and Approval of September 25, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

- a. Mr. Sims asked if there were any questions or comments before we motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting. There were none. Mr. Sims asked if there was a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Ms. Fuller motioned to approve. Ms. Kremicki seconded. Meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

#### **Action Items**

- a. Nursing Course Fee Requests

Mr. Sims asked if there was any further discussion or questions on the nursing fees that were presented last week. Mr. Bruno asked how the faculty supply kit will apply to these new nursing fees, if at all. Mr. Greiner explained that the faculty use this kit to demonstrate the new skills each student learns and then students have their own materials they use to replicate what was demonstrated. Mr. Bruno asked if this is something that the department should be paying for instead of the students. Mr. Greiner stated that students should pay since it is part of the laboratory learning and that the only way the students will know what to do is if the faculty demonstrate it in the labs.

Mr. Sims asked for any last-minute comments, questions, or discussion on the Nursing Course Fees request. There were none.

Mr. Sims asked for a motion to vote to approve the Nursing course fees for Spring 2021. Ms. Sanchez made a motion and Mr. Holt seconded; 13 members voted yes to approve and 1 member voted not to approve. CFAC recommended to approve the Nursing Course Fees request.

#### **Informational Items**

- a. Approved Category IV Fees

Mr. Sims opened to continue the discussion on the Category IV fees that were presented as an information item at the last meeting. He introduced three guests attending the meeting to answer any questions members may have about these fees; Ms. Anderson from the registrar's office to discuss the Late Registration fee and the Transcript fee; Dr. Wood from Student Affairs and Campus Diversity to answer questions on the First-Year Experience fee; Ms. Dooley from Student Affairs and Campus Diversity – Student Health Services to answer questions on the No-Show fee.

Mr. Sims started discussion on the Late Registration fee. Ms. Chen asked for clarification in regards to the market analysis of comparison institutions as mentioned in the fee summary. Ms. Anderson responded that the market

research was done not only on CSU institutions but on other institutions that match SDSU both in size, graduation outcomes, and other comparable areas. Also looked at were schools in the UC System such as UC San Diego, UC Irvine and UC Davis and out of state institutions such as Arizona State University and Rutgers University, all of which have the \$50 late registration fee. Ms. Anderson emphasized that this fee is not one that the university wants to charge in large volumes. This fee is applied to students who register on or after the first day of classes and that it is frequently waived if there are mitigating circumstances that cause the student not to be able to enroll in a timely manner. The goal is to incentivize students to register early and make sure they are not missing out on any educational days in the semester. Ms. Chen stated that raising the fee is not necessarily helpful to students since that money could potentially go towards purchasing textbooks and invest in their actual courses.

Ms. Martelino asked why we are comparing market prices to out of state universities and UCs when we are a CSU. Ms. Anderson stated that the group that conducted the market research also looked at other CSUs that are comparable to SDSU, specifically Cal Poly SLO and San Jose State University and noted that Cal Poly is still charging \$25, however they are charging their fee much earlier than SDSU is.

Mr. Sims stepped in to add more context behind the fee. He explained that in the previous term, about 70 students were charged, which is not a high volume of students whom are being charged this fee. Mr. Sepulveda asked why if only 70 students were charged this fee, what is the incentive to charge this fee in the first place. Mr. Sims explained that the purpose is to encourage students to register ahead of time, as there are many administrative duties required when students try to register late.

Mr. Bruno asked how much it helps the actual staff members to perform their jobs better when students register on time versus going back and redoing everything when a student is late to register. Ms. Anderson explained that when a student registers late there is more administrative overhead, not necessarily within enrollment services, but within the colleges. Early registration assists the colleges in better planning for course demand and if there is a high volume of late registration, the colleges have less time to determine if they need to open more sections or offer more classes and plan for true demand in their courses. Mr. Bruno followed up by stating there are two incentives; one is beneficial for students as they can be offered more courses and the other is beneficial to the staff and the work they do.

Mr. Holt asked which students are typically late to register for classes and what the reason is. Mr. Sims stated that he does not have the data on the 70 students right now, but that it can be provided if the committee would like to see it. He noted that he typically sees varying personal reasons for late registration and every student case is different. Ms. Anderson added that the fee is typically waived, especially if there was an administrative issue that could have caused them to register late and that the university takes each students' unique circumstances into consideration. Mr. Bruno asked if there are numbers that show how many fees were waived and how many were charged. Ms. Anderson stated that unfortunately they do not have a tracking on that.

Ms. Sanchez stated that if you offer to waive the fee and now that it is especially difficult to get ahold of administrative staff, if a student petitions to waive a fee, they could have already been charged the fee, which becomes a very long process of trying to then get the fee waived, noting that when the reason students do not register on time is because of personal reasons and that a fee increase should not be justified by the fact that the fee could be potentially waived. Mr. Penner added that each student has their own unique story of why they could not register on time. He asked for an explanation as to what the fee increase would be used for. Ms. Anderson responded that the increase would help with course planning for the colleges, reducing the need for adjustments by administrative staff and that when students register on time it generally makes the overall process go smoother. She added that when students register late it causes fewer spots in classes and waitlists causing colleges to work behind the scenes to see if they need to open up another section, all in an attempt to make sure that the students get at least one class. Ms. Martelino asked whether the data for late registering students is specific to one college versus others; that 70 students divided by 7 colleges would be 10 students per college; if this is causing staffing issues in not being able to allocate time for students and would like for this data to be provided; if it is overload in one specific area are there other ways to address this. Mr. Holt interjected that for the sake of time, we all agree that this is an awareness or education issue and not a student issue. He suggested moving on to discuss the next fee.

Mr. Sims opened discussion on the Transcript fee. Ms. Tamayo mentioned that she was told she could only send an electronic transcript and asked if this is going to be continuous and if we need to print out transcripts or if more people were accepting certified online transcripts. Ms. Anderson stated that they have been sending out physical transcripts during the entirety of the campus closure but that it has been on a reduced schedule as it requires IT staff to be on campus monitoring those printers as well as registrar staff to prepare and print the transcripts. She

added that they've moved to having the current vendor take care of the electronic transcripts in addition to the printed transcripts. Therefore, most of this fee will go to cover the vendor's cost of printing these transcripts. This would mean there would be no disruption in sending transcripts. They are now being sent within 1 business day. This also expands the ability for students to send rush transcripts and also noted that the University did not have the ability to send rush transcripts before but that now students have the option of sending FedEx transcripts both domestically and overseas, which has vastly improved the timeliness of students getting their transcripts. This especially helps if we continue to work remotely and have limited staff on campus. Ms. Tamayo asked how long it currently takes to get your transcript. Ms. Anderson stated that if you order a paper transcript as of today, it would be ordered through our parchment vendor. Electronic transcripts are being sent out within 24 hours, often within 15-30 minutes. Paper transcripts, depending on what time the order was placed would typically be mailed out in 1 business day. She noted that they were mailing twice a week before they moved over to the vendor, which could cause a delay depending on when the transcript was ordered. Ms. Tamayo asked if the \$5 increase is going towards the vendor or the expedited mailing. Ms. Anderson stated that it would go towards the vendor to cover their own fees in printing and sending out the transcripts.

Ms. Chen asked that if a student were to order a rush transcript, would there be an extra fee included? Ms. Anderson responded that if a rush transcript is to be mailed there would be an additional mailing fee and that if an electronic rush transcript is requested, there would be no additional fees. Ms. Chen asked that if the increase is helping with the rush transcript would the increase cover those costs. Ms. Anderson clarified that it would cover the service they could provide and that previously they did not have the ability to offer the option for rush transcripts for an additional mailing cost. With this vendor they are now able to offer the option of a rush transcript if the student wants to pay an additional fee. Ms. Chen asked if this service is currently not being offered and the fee is now increased it would then be provided. Ms. Anderson stated that they have already moved to providing this service and this is to help SDSU recoup the costs. Mr. Sims asks for any last questions or comments and there were none.

Mr. Sims moved on to introduce Dr. Wood and opened discussion on the First Year Experience Fee. Dr. Woods noted that he is aware of a presentation provided to the CFAC committee at last week's meeting and he wanted to come and answer specific questions anyone may have about this fee.

Dr. Ely started by saying that he fully supports the uses of the fee and the activities that surround orientation. He then noted that it seems the money is all going towards that one office to support the activities and asked that when additional fees are being considered for orientation, is their consideration to direct some of that money towards Academic Affairs since there are academic advisors and faculty specific to the colleges that interact with the students during summer orientation and sometimes on a voluntary basis. Ms. Fuller wrote in the chat: To David's point, advisors are often asked to attend and present at orientation without compensation, in addition to their advising duties. Dr. Wood responded to Dr. Ely by saying that he had made a good point and that they do offset a lot of the costs across Academic Affairs and vice versa. Providing part of the funding to Academic Affairs was not part of this conversation in terms of how this was set up. However, there are other ideas they are exploring that might be good for that and noted that he will connect with Hector and Joanna and go from there.

Ms. Fuller asked for the current number of incoming students that are attending orientation, whether there is a concern that this drastic increase in this fee will reduce the number of students that would attend orientation because they simply cannot afford it and whether it is in the best interest of the university if we are trying to onboard students well. Dr. Wood replied that he does not have the exact number but that an overwhelming majority of students are attending orientation and that there is no real trend considering this was the first year that orientation was offered to graduate students. The fee is designed to expand out what is currently taking place and if you look at other institutions, they are transforming to a first-year experience with robust support and intentional programming that goes along with that and this fee helps to bring alignment on that. Dr. Wood continued saying they tried to set this up in a way that responds to what the students said was important to them and use it in a way to expand outward. Ms. Fuller enters in the chat: To my previous point (her response to Dr. Ely's statement earlier), it makes sense that many advisors are not on contract over the summer but they're expected to come to work for orientation during the summer, or, there is a demand for their presence because of their area knowledge of expertise even though we're not contracting them to work over the summer. Ms. Fuller then asked that, to Dr. Ely's point, if some of this money could go to making sure the advisors are more robustly included in the process and perhaps given different contracts or additional summer contracts so that it would be more equitable and fair to them. Dr. Wood stated that they are open to this suggestion and noted that what they are working on now is what that would look like. Dr. Wood noted that he realizes this is an elevated rise in cost, however given the importance they see in the whole first year being such an important transition for students, they feel it is a worthwhile cost. Ms. Fuller then asked if there is a way for students who cannot afford orientation to have those fees waived and what that process would be. Dr. Wood

explained that he believes this has a return to aid component but will return to this committee if he finds that is incorrect. This would be mean that if a student could not pay, there would be a fund created that would cover it. Ms. Dooley noted that there is not a formal return to aid, but thinks there is a mechanism that would support students who are unable to pay. Mr. Sims added that students who qualify for fee postponement of this fee would work with the financial aid office to have it paid from their financial aid funds. Mr. Holt asked how a student would know if they could postpone payment of the fee. Mr. Sims stated that students would work with the financial aid office and new student orientation to get that information. Ms. Martelino asked if students would have to find that information or if it would be provided to them. Mr. Sims stated that he is unsure of the process, but that this currently happens for students who cannot pay these fees up-front and that more information on this can be provided later if needed.

Mr. Sepulveda asked what the justification would be for a student to use their financial aid to cover orientation instead of paying for books, since financial aid is already limited. Dr. Wood responded that for many students this would come out of their financial aid as it is seen as a critical cost. He noted that from his perspective many students enter universities and take on debt, and he sees this program as one of the strongest interventions they have to ensure those students that are paying that money will make a successful transition and that ultimately, the benefits would outweigh the costs. Mr. Sepulveda followed up with his own personal experience with his first year at SDSU and asked if these additional costs would go towards programming or salary and benefits. Dr. Wood responded that the fee will be used for both and also noted that since Mr. Sepulveda shared that his first-year experience wasn't positive, that it further proves the importance of investing in doing this the right way. Dr. Wood also emphasized that the presentation to the committee last week is just the framework in terms of how they plan to move forward, but they specifically want to work closely with the student leaders on this committee to ensure the program ends up how it should be, offering an open invitation to the students to attend a planning meeting to provide their perspective on how to make sure this program is successful.

Mr. Bruno asked if there is a contingency plan in the event this program has a significant drop in attendance. Dr. Wood stated that they have a very limited reserve and would look into other funding sources but that regardless, they would not sacrifice the quality of the student experience and noted that this year they did the best they could to provide a successful virtual orientation to incoming students.

Ms. Tamayo asked about the possibility to waive this fee. Dr. Wood explained that this is a voluntary fee and that students do not have to pay if they don't want to participate. Mr. Holt clarified Ms. Tamayo's question in that if a student went to SDSU as an undergraduate and decided to continue as a master's student, would the fee be waived to attend graduate orientation since they have already paid the fee to attend undergraduate orientation? Dr. Wood responded that if you did not want to go to orientation then you would not have to pay the fee, however if you did want to attend then you would have to pay the fee to attend as a graduate student.

Ms. Fuller entered in the chat: "I should note I was impressed by the CARES Team effort to follow up with students. I think there is value there, I just wish that these types of models could be funded without a steep increase in fees". Mr. Holt followed up with a question regarding what Ms. Fuller included in the chat indicating that it looks like the majority of this fee would go towards salary and benefits, how many students would be hired on for this and where would the cost savings be if we had students to take on these roles instead of staff. Dr. Wood noted that students make up the majority of those cold calling through the CARES Team, however there are certain tasks that must be done by staff due to different laws such as HIPPA and that currently student ambassadors conduct campus tours on a volunteer basis for which this program would allow them to be paid for their services.

Mr. Penner followed up asking if this fee increase will go towards hiring more student ambassadors and faculty or go towards increasing their hours and would this mean they would become a lot more accessible to students. Dr. Wood answered that this would absolutely go towards compensating those that have been doing the work free of charge as well as other units that are being resourced, to expand out and hire more students and that he really wants students to be involved in this process as although they have created the framework, the student's perspective is needed to bring life to the program.

Mr. Holt notes that the student ambassadors do get paid for the work they do in the summer. Dr. Wood responded that they do, however the tours they do throughout the year are volunteered time. Mr. Holt added that being an ambassador is one of the highest volunteer honors, is notable for being very time consuming, but is known across the nation as volunteer work. He stated that if we are paying ambassadors, then it is a different role. Dr. Wood noted that he understands Mr. Holt's perspective, but that San Diego is an extremely expensive place to live and that he doesn't feel comfortable asking students to perform functions that are more geared towards a job where they should be compensated for the work. Dr. Wood then emphasized that a follow up meeting should occur to

address the production of this program. Mr. Sims intervened to move on to the next fee. Ms. Fuller requested one last question, asking if there's a discussion about asking non-professional students to do professional work. Dr. Wood stated that they are only asking students to complete tasks that are in the realm of what student assistants do.

Mr. Sims moved on to Ms. Dooley's presentation on the No-Show Fee. Ms. Dooley provided a brief overview on the fee and stated that it is a goal to change student behavior and that this is not inconsistent with how other CSUs have implemented their fee. This is to be implemented for Fall 2021 as a \$25 fee for a missed appointment or for appointments cancelled within 24 hours. The reason that Student Health Services is waiting to implement this fee is to improve their current communications with students. They plan to implement a text reminder feature and an easy way for students to cancel their appointments. The reason for the fee is that there was a high percentage of students that were not showing up to their appointments. Ms. Dooley emphasized that there is no fee being collected yet and that they want to improve their system beforehand and set a system in place before doing so. She also mentioned that the fee would go towards supporting students who are unable to afford paying for health-related services.

Mr. Penner asked what the process is for getting students insured. Ms. Dooley responded saying that they have a representative who assists with helping students get insured and checks for various eligibility for coverage. Mr. Penner then asked if this representative is an outsourced employee. Ms. Dooley stated we have various MOUs with the County of San Diego as well as HomeStar, a local non-profit whose mission is to enroll members of the San Diego County in medical insurance and that they have an office space set up on campus to help assist students. Mr. Penner asked if the goal is to cover students long-term or just when they are a student. Ms. Dooley responded that the goal is to inform students about medical insurance and educate them so that they can rely on their employer's offered medical insurance in the long-term.

Ms. Chen asked if the fee applies to students who reschedule within 24 hours. Ms. Dooley responded that it does not apply and that they want students to provide communication so that the appointment can be properly reassigned elsewhere. Ms. Chen followed up stating her concern is specific to psychiatry appointments specifically as it could deem more detrimental towards those students. Ms. Dooley appreciated the feedback and will take it into consideration when they move towards implementing their new process. She does mention that they do not think it is currently necessary to implement a fee towards counseling and psychology appointments since they have a high turnout rate. She then stated that this fee would only be towards student health services and psychiatry appointments. Mr. Holt commented that he finds it difficult that they are starting the awareness campaign while implementing the fee. Ms. Dooley clarified that the awareness campaign would be implemented before the fees would take effect. Their goal is to have the text feature set up for Spring 2021 and the fee would be implemented Fall 2021 which will provide an extensive grace period as they are transitioning.

Mr. Sims thanked everyone for their time and moved on to closing out the meeting.

## **New Business**

- a. None

## **Public Comment**

Mr. Holt noted that it seemed most of this committee does not agree with some of the CAT IV fees presented, suggesting that although the committee is not voting on these fees, they should voice which fees they agree with and which they do not and that it is important to voice the opinions of the people they are representing. Mr. Holt asked before adjourning the meeting, how they may proceed to voice their thoughts about the fees. Ms. Fuller suggested they write up a resolution to be presented to the President. Mr. Holt agreed and asked if this work would happen within or outside of CFAC. Ms. Fuller noted that in other committees, members work outside and present it to the committee to vote on as to whether to proceed with presenting it to the President to ask for feedback. Ms. Little asked if Mr. Holt would like to head a CFAC subcommittee with whomever would like to join. She then offered Ms. Almenanza to help organize the subcommittee and provide contact information for Mr. Holt. Mr. Holt agreed that he would like to head this subcommittee and asked if there is a minimum amount of people that would need to take part in this. Ms. Little confirmed there is no minimum amount of people needed.

Mr. Sims asked if there were any last comments.

Mr. Sims asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.  
Mr. Holt moved to adjourn the meeting and Ms. Sanchez seconded.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:03 P.M.

**Reminder:** Next meeting is scheduled for Friday, October 16<sup>th</sup>, at 12:00 P.M. via Zoom