

## CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

November 20, 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
		Abi Tamayo
Non-voting Members:	Dana Smith	
Guests:	Ben Compton	Beth Warren
	Christina Brown	Crystal Little
	Kathy Brown	Matias Farre
	Randall Timm	Kara Bauer
	Paul Melchior	Cynthia Cervantes
	Raja Gainey	

The meeting began at 12:02 P.M. by T'Ante Sims, CFAC Chair.

#### **Review and Approval of October 2, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Sims asked if there are any discussion items on the last meeting's minutes and there were none.

Mr. Sims asked if there is a motion to approve these minutes. Mr. Holt moves to approve. Ms. Fuller seconds. The meeting minutes from October 2, 2020 were approved unanimously via voting through the chat feature.

#### **Informational Items**

##### a. Cat V Housing 2021/22 Fee Proposal

Mr. Sims introduced the two informational items that will be presented to the committee. He explained that Category IV and V fees are typically already approved by the president prior to being presented to the committee, but due to the discussion from the last meeting, they have been brought to the committee before being approved by the President. Ms. Cervantes and her team, Dr. Bauer, Mr. Gainey, and Mr. Melchior presented their Housing Proposal. Ms. Cervantes explained the housing program noting that it takes several departments and partnerships to operate on-campus housing. Dr. Bauer continued by discussing the different partnerships that on-campus housing has within the University's various divisions and colleges. Ms. Cervantes transitioned over to student profiles. She notes that due to the current pandemic there is a significant decrease in how many students they welcomed this fall for on-campus housing noted that they decreased the density of how many students they allowed and precautionary methods taken such as only occupying their suites and apartment style buildings. The students welcomed this year and Housing were able to accommodate students from across the country and abroad and provided context as to who is living on campus as compared to last year. Ms. Cervantes noted they put a pause on their 2-year residency requirement this year and the plan is to reinstate this next year. Dr. Bauer discussed residential programming and went over the benefits of living on campus, the amenities provided, residential education, which provides emotional and physical support and safety for students, residential learning communities, star centers (provides academic support), leadership initiatives and citizenship initiatives which provide the tools for students to learn responsibilities once they leave the university, diversity and inclusion initiatives and continued programs to assist students in the future. Ms. Cervantes mentioned budget cuts that Housing received and mentioned the recent facility projects that have been put on hold due to COVID, although they were able to make some improvements on Aztec Corner and Chapultepec. She mentioned the various actions taken on the facilities to be in compliance with the rules and regulations set by the CDC for COVID-19 prevention. Ms. Cervantes provided Housing budget data for both fiscal years 2019/20 and 2020/21 and noted that this year's budget will look significantly different due to cuts caused by the pandemic, considering the decrease in students they allowed for on-campus housing this year causing them to operate at a loss. Having recently received the actual numbers for the Fall semester, the number of students is less

than what they had budgeted for, resulting in actual revenues being about \$7 million less than what was budgeted. They continue to provide normal services to ensure students are receiving all the benefits and amenities as promised. Ms. Cervantes noted that Housing did receive a loan from the University to help mitigate these losses.

Ms. Cervantes moved on to discuss the proposed rates and fee changes. Ms. Cervantes noted that a 3.9% - 4.5% increase in Residence Halls Fees, 4% increase in Apartments (9-month), and a 4% increase for Apartments (11.5-month) has been proposed. Typically, there would be a 3% increase in these fees. Ms. Cervantes provided a breakdown of what the rates would look like for 2021-2022 with their proposed rates. Ms. Cervantes then showed the increase of initial payment fees (from \$375 to \$500), lockout fee (from \$25 to \$35), and early arrival fee (from \$55 to \$60). Mr. Melchior provided a dining services update starting with what has been done this year, noting the traditional meal plan has been switched to a Flex meal plan due to the current pandemic, which was very costly and resulted in a use of their reserves. Mr. Melchior discussed the various meal plans offered to students and changes they have taken to accommodate the current state. Dr. Bauer discussed new initiatives for Housing starting with programming and Starts Centers re-imagined, enhancing the academic support services provided to students. Ms. Cervantes adds that they had opportunity to expand this program and make some additional investments since repurposing the ARC recreational fees historically charged to students. This will now be embedded in the other student fees, reallocating those funds to support this program. Mr. Gainey discussed the development opportunities for Housing. He discussed the benefits of living on campus and the programs available to help assist students with the transitional process and their experience at this University. Mr. Gainey stated that his role is building a community and providing support to the University and how critical this is to help support 1<sup>st</sup> generation students. This is the first of its kind across the country in terms of how it is addressing housing and food insecurity. Mr. Gainey listed the various scholarships he's been involved in establishing to support 1<sup>st</sup> generation students, announcing they have secured their first major gift which is a \$25,000 donation. Congratulations were offered by the committee.

Ms. Cervantes asked for any questions. Ms. Martellino asked about the rates for M@College. She stated that M@College recently raised their lock out fees from \$25 to \$50 and asks if the University had any say in this increase or if the company themselves increased it. Ms. Cervantes stated that they do work closely with M@College, but when it comes to their fees, the University does not have decision rights. She offered to connect with M@College as they were not made aware of the increase. Ms. Martellino asked for clarification on the proposed fee as a single is currently around \$1,400. Ms. Cervantes asked if Ms. Martellino is referring to the University's rates or M@College. Ms. Martellino confirmed she is asking about M@College. Ms. Cervantes noted that the proposed fee of \$17,300 is paid through installments over a 10-month time frame. Ms. Chen thanked them for the presentation and described her understanding of why the lock out fee is implemented and noting that this fee can cause a lot of distress for students. She noted that lock outs do happen and that there are instances where students are debating whether to pay the lock out fee or trying to determine if they can afford to be late for their test while waiting for their roommate to come back. Ms. Chen stated that she does not agree with that fee and asked if there is a different way to resolve this issue other than raising the fee. Ms. Cervantes thanked Ms. Chen for her input on a different perspective to this fee. They will consider her input and try to decide on other creative ways to remind folks about their keys in planning for next year. Mr. Sims interjected stating Mr. Pennera will be the last question before moving on to the next information item. Mr. Pennera asked for clarification on the meal plan option for Sophomores as to whether they have the option to opt out if they choose not to use it next year. Mr. Melchior answered stating this will affect the Freshmen cohort of 2021 and in February 2022 they will be prompted to choose between the 4 different meal plans or opt out at that point. So, they will be able to opt out before they hit the fall semester of their Sophomore year. Ms. Cervantes thanks everyone for their time and suggested the committee reach out with any further questions.

#### b. Cat IV Equitable Access Fee Proposal

Mr. Sims moved on to introduce the Equitable Access Fee Proposal and turns it over to Ms. Kathy Brown and Mr. Compton. Ms. Brown introduced the change effective Fall 2021 from Immediate Access to the new model called Equitable Access. She continued going through data they have compiled that contains textbooks, course materials, student success, and access to textbooks percentages. She provided data from two surveys that shows how early access to materials and textbooks affects the success of students, concluding that costs and availability of textbooks heavily affects students as to how this could impact their grades. Mr. Compton explained that since Immediate Access was launched in Spring 2016, they have been able to expand the program by offering immediate access to over 1200 courses, representing over 174,000 seats participating in the program. With Fall 2020 being virtual, they have been able to onboard 402 courses, with just under 50,000 seats. Mr. Compton stated that students have saved a lot of money, noted that since the program started students have saved over \$16.4 million. When you compare Immediate Access to new print books or national digital pricing, over \$4.6 million is saved. The Immediate Access program delivers digital books to students free of charge for the first two weeks of the semester and they have the

opportunity to opt out of the program. Those that continue to stay in the program will be charged a discounted fee. Ms. Brown introduced Equitable Access as being very similar to Immediate Access with the main difference of Equitable Access students will still have the opportunity to opt out of the program, but they will have to opt out of the entire program not just on a class by class basis. The most important part of this program is the predictable cost of the program. Currently students pay pricing for textbooks at a wide range. This model is a flat fee rate model that will allow students to budget from semester to semester. Ms. Brown noted that they have worked with an actuary firm called Milliman to determine a base price on what they could offer students and that this pricing model is not set in stone as they are still trying to determine what this would look like. She provides an example that if each course costs \$65 and a student takes 5 courses, they would be paying \$325/ semester, reiterating this is only an example and they still need to go through negotiations with the publishers. They hope to get that rate below \$65 and plan on starting a marketing campaign in February that will include students and faculty. Ms. Brown asked for any questions. Mr. Penea asked if the marketing campaign will continue beyond February and throughout the Spring semester, in order to reduce any confusion between the Immediate Access and Equitable Access programs. Ms. Brown responded stating that the marketing program will get students prepared for Fall 2021 so that those who have already been participating in Immediate Access will not have confusion between the two programs and stated that they always do a marketing campaign for incoming freshmen so that they understand the program. Mr. Penea asked if this will be done through emails or blackboard announcements. Ms. Brown noted that it will be publicized everywhere and there will be videos for students and faculty, emails, social media posts and possibly some student ambassadors to help get the word out. She noted that they are open to suggestions anyone may have to get this information out to students. Ms. Chen asked if they are looking into allowing Professors to opt out of this so that students wouldn't have to worry about opting out of those classes. Ms. Brown stated that only the students have the option to opt out and not the faculty who are aware there are classes that do not have any added costs for materials, so they are going to continue to provide students their booklist which lists pricing for their classes and what prices they would pay if they were to opt out of the program. This will give students the opportunity to decide if it's financially better to stay in the program or to opt out. Ms. Chen asked if students are only able to opt out of the entire Equitable Access program and not on a class by class basis. Ms. Brown confirmed that is correct. Mr. Compton added that another difference between these two programs is that there are courses that have course materials that are not available digitally, they will be providing physical books for those classes. Ms. Brown added that not every book is available in a digital format but due to the pandemic, publishers have been moving towards offering digital copies. Mr. Sims asked for any remaining questions or comments, there are none. Mr. Sims thanked Ms. Brown and Mr. Compton for their time and moves on to the next item on the agenda.

### **Action Items**

#### **a. SSF-ARP Level 3 Recommendations**

Mr. Sims introduced the action item on today's agenda and handed it over to Mr. Holt to present the Student Success Fee – Academic Related Program (ARP) Level 3 Proposal. Mr. Holt presented the worksheet that shows all the approved student success fee proposals. There were three different levels, the process on level 2 was broken up into the different tiers of expenses and then today, level 3 was reviewed by AS (Associated Students) for which they made their final approvals. He noted that to the far right of the worksheet notes are included for every application which they used, along with proposals, to help determine if an application would be approved. Mr. Holt then continues stating that 88 proposals were approved out of 93 proposals given ending with a total of \$972,399 awarded. Mr. Sims opened it up to any questions or comments. Mr. Bruno asked for a copy of this list. Ms. Little noted that this is posted on the Student Success Fee website. Mr. Holt noted that the 5 that were not awarded did not meet the requirement of being virtual. Mr. Timm asked if those that were not awarded was due to them not being COVID related. Mr. Holt responds that something in each of those proposals did not follow policy which is why they were not awarded. Mr. Sims asked for any other questions or comments. Dr. Ely asked how soon the awardees will be notified that their proposals have been funded. Mr. Sims responded that they will be contacted next week. He then asked for any last questions or comments. There were none.

Mr. Sims asked if there is a motion to approve these proposals.

Ms. Chen made a motion (first) and Mr. Penea seconded.

Mr. Sims opened a poll in the chat to approve these proposals. The SSF-ARP Level 3 Recommendations were unanimously approved.

### **New Business**

#### **a. None**

**Public Comment**

- a. None

Mr. Sims asked if there is a motion to adjourn the meeting.  
Mr. Bruno made a motion (first), Mr. Holt seconded.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:55 P.M.

**Reminder:** Next meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 4th, at 12:00 P.M. via Zoom