

CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

November 19, 2021

MINUTES

ATTENDEES

Members:	Amanda Fuller	Ashley Tejada
	David Ely	Karina Esteban
	Rashmi Praba	Jennifer Schenkenfelder
	T'Ante Sims	Stephen Jackson
	Mark Bruno	Alexia Oduro
	Mikhail Portnoy	Carlos Fitch
	Hala Madanat	Erika Gutierrez
	Savanna Schuermann	Austin Barber
	Mark B. Reed	
Guests:	Crystal Little	Matias Farre
	Beth Warren	Eric Hansen
	Christy Samarkos	Ted Gonzalez
	Craig Winton	James Frazee
	Jerry Sheehan	Maribel Madero
	Rose Pasenelli	Sarah Brewer
	Suzanne Goulet	

The meeting was called to order 11:02 A.M. by T'Ante Sims, CFAC Chair.

Review and Approval of October 22, 2021, Meeting Minutes

- a. Mr. Sims asked if there were any questions or comments for last meeting's minutes. Mr. Fitch noted that the committee had not received the statistics collected for the Graduate Student Experience Fee Proposal and motioned to postpone the approval of these minutes till the data has been received. Approval of these meeting minutes will be postponed till the next meeting.

Action Items

- a. SSF Level 2 Approval

Ms. Praba stated that they are requesting CFAC approval for Level 2 Student Success Fee Proposals. She gave a quick review of the process discussed at a previous meeting with Dr. Timm. Ms. Praba continued that the Level 1 review occurred last Friday. The total number of proposals received was 107 totaling up to 1.87 million dollars in proposals. She also added that this included proposals from the Imperial Valley Campus. Ms. Praba then reviewed the 'Yes' proposals as they have been chosen to be funded, the 'Incomplete' tab which needed further follow up, and the 'No' tab those not chosen to be funded. Ms. Praba noted that 81 proposals were approved totaling to \$1.5 million. She then explained the breakdown of the budget. The 2021/22 fiscal year projected revenue was \$1.4 million which this year includes Imperial Valley Campus. They had \$1.5 million worth of Carry-Forward, total requests for Fall 2021 were \$1.8 million and total approved was \$1.5 million. Ms. Praba noted that they will be allocating some of the carry-forward funds to some of the approved requests in order to help fund them.

Ms. Praba opened it up for questions. Ms. Little asked to clarify how the Spring cycle fits in with the budget breakdown. Ms. Praba answered that there are still conversations going on around how they will budget for this. She continued that once she has a firm answer, she will share it with the committee. Ms. Praba then discussed that there were some proposals received that were incomplete and because this new process is in a growth phase, they did not want to kick these proposals out, instead they will be offering students another opportunity to complete their proposals. Some of the factors that deemed the proposal incomplete were that the students did not list who their guest speakers were. This resulted in security clearance issue, therefore, they were unable to be awarded this Fall cycle.

Ms. Schuermann asked if the SSF comes from the students. Ms. Praba confirmed that is correct. Ms. Schuermann then asked how they ended up with a large carry forward. Ms. Praba answered that the large carry forward is the result of the pandemic as students were unable to complete their projects. She also added that carry forward is expected every year as sometimes students over budget or for whatever reason did not need to spend all the remaining dollars.

Ms. Tejada asked what was different between the two colors in the incomplete applications tab. Ms. Praba answered that the green highlighted are the incomplete applications and the yellow highlighted are the ones they need to some follow-up with respect to certain items were noted as in the budget and SACD needs to do some follow-up with campus experts just to make sure that those expenses do indeed align with the SSF policy.

Mr. Fitch asked that since he submitted a proposal, should he refrain from voting. Ms. Praba confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Sims motioned to approve the Level 2 Student Success Fee Proposals. Dr. Ely seconds. Majority voted yes, with Mr. Fitch abstaining due to submitting a proposal himself. SSF Level 2 Proposals have been approved with a majority vote.

Informational Items

a. Alternative Consultation Process: Accelerating Tech and Sustainability Fee

Ms. Samarkos stated that the University is moving forward with an alternative consultation process. This process is being chosen due to the desire to partner with the students in the opportunity for conversations, to hear students' feedback, suggestions, and thoughts, and to be as transparent as possible. She added that the campus has been listening about accelerating technology and sustainability and are now taking action. They would like to include the campus community in this process. Ms. Little stated that the campus has done alternative consultations in the past and a detailed timeline will be shared at the next meeting. They are looking at the February timeline to host a series of forums where they would invite student organizations and other student groups to host as well as offer open forums. She continued that in those forums there would be a presentation in much more detail than what is being presented today as they are still working through some of the details. The forums will include information to the students on what the fee is really supporting and how it will benefit students. During these forums, students will be provided a feedback form for us to collect and gain insight on the perspectives of the students. The hope is that there will be open dialogue and questions during the forums. Ms. Little continued that the feedback will be collected, consolidated and brought back to CFAC to assist in the decision of whether or not to recommend the fee proposal move forward for approval to the President. If it does move forward to approval from the President, then because it is a Category II mandatory fee, it would go one step further to the Chancellor's Office for the final approval before it is implemented.

Mr. Sheehan began that SDSU has recognized that they have underinvested in technology and sustainability which is limiting some of the student potential. He continued that the first part of this proposal is a broad area that has been recognized as part of the campus' digital transformation in response to COVID. There are several dependencies on technologies that were looked at that have been undercapitalized in the past that we now have been able to fund with one time dollar funds from the Federal government. As these funds are being used, they are concerned how this will look long term once HEERF funding has come to an end. Some examples of what was funded by HEERF was the transition to Canvas the learning management system, invested in new tools such as grade scope (a tool that allows for large, formatted classrooms across disciplines to move beyond bubble sheets and be able to explore and demonstrate competency at the same time provide students with more direct feedback while working through projects particularly chemistry and mathematics). Mr. Sheehan also noted that they took notice to the support provided to students in the last 18 months, there was a training gap and the student to staff ratio did not align. They reevaluated several campus processes and moved into a more electronic workflow such as supporting financial aid and add/drop or withdraw from courses. They are also looking to extend their outdoor wireless coverage across campus which would allow students access to the

internet from anywhere on campus. These are some of the programs that are on one-time funds that are in jeopardy if they do not find a more engaged co-investment strategy.

Mr. Sheehan then addressed that there are some things SDSU does not have that other campuses offer that they feel are limiting the students' experience. One major issue they see is there isn't a smart phone application that does not allow students to access campus programs through their mobile devices. They also see an opportunity to be part of electronic gaming sports divisions as they are seeing more and more campuses offering this. Another opportunity would be to provide various programs for students. For example, an online cloud for research purposes is not currently offered. This would set up students with experience with such programs to help with their future endeavors. He then stated the categories this would support are areas where they know they need support because of COVID and other opportunities where they would assist student growth. Mr. Sheehan noted that a survey was sent out to the campus body earlier this week to determine which areas are of utmost importance.

Mr. Hansen began that back in 2014, former SDSU President Hirshman signed the President's climate commitment indicating to move towards carbon neutrality as a campus. He continued that they launched a climate action plan process, then in 2017 it was finalized where they had operational goals that there would be full carbon neutrality by 2050. Since then, they have been able to include their sustainability efforts in their strategic planning. Mr. Hansen echoed Mr. Sheehan that this request is to accelerate their efforts. Some of what this fee will support are staffing the new office of energy and sustainability, various programs which will include outreach, literacy, and possibility for students to participate in microgrants, it will also support energy infrastructure investments to move towards carbon neutrality. Transportation will also be another effort this will support. Mr. Hansen added that they currently have a 6.4% response rate on the survey that was sent out.

Ms. Schuermann asked how they can ensure that the survey responses are representative of the student body as it is concerning that there is only a 6.4% response rate. Her other question was that it seems the University has the funds but needs to rethink how it prioritizes where the funds are allocated, she then asked why students have to pay this fee instead of the University. Mr. Sheehan answered her first question that if they can get to a 10% response rate, that is better than most of the broad assessments that they have already done, but this really speaks to the need for the alternative consultation. Which will allow for them to hear directly from the students. Mr. Sheehan stated that Ms. Little can speak more about the funding but added that the University is at its boundaries of what it can sustain and has not seen funds being able to move towards these efforts they are presenting. Ms. Little clarified that there is something called base or ongoing resources which is what this fee request is asking for, an ongoing funding source. Ms. Little then discussed how funding is spent and allocated through the University distinguishing the difference between one time and base funding. She also added that they do have a reserve fund, however, these are designated reserves meaning that they have a planned use and once they are used, they cannot be invested on again as they are one-time funds.

Ms. Fuller asked what will happen to the technology efforts that are currently ongoing that are relying on the one time funds. She then asked if they will no longer be prioritized and instead be focusing on the points Mr. Sheehan mentioned earlier. Mr. Sheehan mentioned that they are trying to set the foundation to match the students' needs. The goal is to level the state investment and the students' investment in order to accelerate these programs and fulfill the needs of all campus programs that may need support. Ms. Fuller then addressed Ms. Schuermann that the campus is working on budget transparency throughout the various colleges and are open to faculty feedback.

Mr. Bruno asked if this is for one fee or two. Mr. Sheehan answered that this would be one fee that would support acceleration of technology and sustainability. Mr. Bruno then asked how those two are tied together. Mr. Sheehan then stated that there are a variety of different efforts where they overlap, for example, there aren't any charging stations, accelerated printing and recycling, etc. Mr. Bruno suggested that these be two separate fees that students can choose which fee they would like to participate in.

Mr. Fitch asked for the exact amount students would be paying. Mr. Sheehan stated that they have 3 different levels prepared: \$149, \$199, and \$249. This will be based off students' interest and where they

see the extreme need to implement these processes. Mr. Sheehan added that there is a return to aid component to help students who are unable to afford this.

Ms. Pasenelli explained that the return to aid component would be that a portion of this new fee amount would be turned over to the economic crisis response team. The Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships works closely with that team to ensure students struggling to pay this type of fee would be able to request some help. Ms. Pasenelli ensured that their office is working closely with Mr. Sheehan and CFAC to ensure that the students who are unable to afford this type of fee have options and the best interest of the students are addressed.

Ms. Tejada asked if the fee amounts Mr. Sheehan provided would be charged to students per semester or per academic year. Mr. Sheehan confirmed that it would be charged by semester.

Mr. Fitch asked if this fee would be charged to IVC students. Ms. Little confirmed that is correct, this fee will align from main campus to IVC. Mr. Fitch then voiced that if this new technology is being implemented that IVC should be priority as their classrooms are very outdated. Mr. Sheehan stated that there have been efforts made to address these issues using one-time funds and that IVC is included in their plans when considering the accelerated technology and sustainability fee.

- o CFAC Subcommittee

Ms. Little noted that part of the process before the forums begin is CFAC is in charge of creating an information pamphlet. One of CFAC's responsibilities is to review the pamphlet to ensure that it provides an objective assessment of the information that is being proposed. There will also need to be an approved pro and con listed on the pamphlet that will need to go through CFAC for approval. There will be an ad in the Daily Aztec to solicit suggestions on pros and cons from students. A CFAC subcommittee is needed to help the planning committee for the proposal to ensure that the information pamphlet does provide that objective assessment. Ms. Little continued that they will also look to the CFAC subcommittee to help strategize appropriate communication channels and to ensure maximum participation as we move into the forum phase. Ms. Little asked that there be some volunteers from CFAC to join the subcommittee and plans to meet the week of November 29th as there is a short turn around time to finalize the information for the pamphlet. Ms. Little noted that the meeting on December 3rd was planned to have CFAC vote on the pamphlet, however, due to the Chancellor's visit, the meeting will be postponed to a later date in December.

Ms. Schenkenfelder directed her question to Mr. Sheehan, considering other CSU's and other campuses are able to provide updated technology similar to what Mr. Sheehan presented, why is it looking to students contribution of these dollars instead of the University. She noted that there are campuses with much smaller budget that are not charging students these fees. Mr. Sheehan answered that from his understanding the other CSU campuses do not have the complexity that SDSU does and the number of students that this campus supports nor the research intensity and breadth of instructional offerings. He noted that SDSU is different than other campuses, however if you look at the benchmarks inside the CSU of those about similar size to SDSU, we are differentially vested than others meaning that they have a competitive advantage that our students do not have that is why we are looking for this co-investment strategy. Mr. Sheehan continued that if you look at the 3 fee levels discussed, he ensured that they went back and did their due diligence and benchmarked extensively.

Ms. Schenkenfelder then asked that instead of reevaluating the investment on a university level, the strategy then is to go to the students to have them pay the fee. Mr. Sheehan answered that he views it more as a co-investment with students and the University.

Mr. Sims interjected that they were running low on time and suggested that any further questions be brought up individually to himself, Ms. Little or Mr. Sheehan and they can address any inquiries received.

Requests

- a. None

New Business

- a. None

Public Comment

- a. Mr. Fitch offered to be part of the subcommittee
- b. Ms. Little suggested to check out the budget transparency portal on the website since there have been several questions about budget. She also adds that they will ensure the pamphlet addresses budgetary questions.

Mr. Sims motioned to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Sims adjourned the meeting at 12:01 P.M.

Reminder: Next meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 17th, at 11:00 A.M. via Zoom.