

## CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

December 17, 2021

### MINUTES

#### **ATTENDEES**

Members:	Amanda Fuller	Alexia Oduro
	David Ely	Austin Barber
	Mary Anne Kremicki	Carlos Fitch
	Rashmi Praba	Shawki Moore
	T'Ante Sims	
	Mikhail Portnoy	
	Savanna Schuermann	
Guests:	Crystal Little	Eric Hansen
	Jerry Sheehan	Feion Villodas
	Beth Warrem	Aniesha Mitchell
	Ted Gonzalez	

The meeting was called to order 11:04 A.M. by T'Ante Sims, CFAC Chair.

#### **Review and Approval of October 22, 2021, Meeting Minutes**

- a. Mr. Sims stated that at the last CFAC meeting, Mr. Fitch requested to have the data concerning the graduate life fee that was proposed. Mr. Sims requested to review that data and opened it up for discussion. He asked Mr. Fitch if this was what he had requested. Mr. Fitch confirmed that is correct. Mr. Sims motioned to approve the meeting minutes. Ms. Praba second. Meeting minutes have been approved with Mr. Fitch abstaining.

#### **Review and Approval of November 19, 2021, Meeting Minutes**

- a. Mr. Sims asked if there were any questions for these meeting minutes. There were none. He motioned to approve. Dr. Ely second. Meeting minutes have been approved.

#### **Informational Items**

- a. SACD Fee Clarification

Mr. Sims suggested going through the informational items first to provide more time to discuss the action item. There was no objection. Ms. Mitchell started that she wanted to clarify the information discussed at the October 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting regarding the graduate student experience fee. The proposal indicated that this is an opt out fee and the proposal is indeed accurate. She continued that this is a category IV fee and is optional to students. Ms. Mitchell also wanted to clarify that she has had conversations with Ms. Love from Graduate Studies, and she shared that the College of Graduate Studies has no position on this fee. She continued that in terms of this being an opt out fee, Ms. Mitchell is working with campus partners, information technology, financial aid and student accounts on identifying a process that will be implemented if this fee is adopted. That process will be a comprehensive process and consist of a comprehensive communication plan. Ms. Mitchell continued that they would work with Associated Students and Graduate Student Association in crafting that plan to communicate with students about this fee. Ms. Little asked to clarify if this fee and the restorative fee start dates for implementation would be Fall 2022. Ms. Mitchell confirmed that this is correct.

Mr. Sims opened it up for questions. Ms. Schuermann asked for clarification if they must opt out or opt in and if it is indeed opt-out, Ms. Mitchell and her team are working on a process to communicate this with students. Ms. Mitchell confirmed that students would need to opt out of this fee, and they are indeed finalizing a process on communicating this.

There were no further questions.

b. Annual Campus Fee Report

Ms. Little shared that per executive order, we are required to share with CFAC an annual report of the campus fee report across all categories except for the mandatory tuition fee. She continued that due to time constraints, this will be discussed in more detail at a future meeting if the committee had any questions or comments.

**Action Items**

a. Alternative Consultation Pamphlet

Ms. Little stated that at the last CFAC meeting, a subcommittee was formed to work with the sponsors for the proposed fee to develop the information pamphlet for use in the alternative consultation process. The subcommittee met last week and have been continuing their work on providing feedback for the information pamphlet. Ms. Little then reminded the committee of the process of this alternative consultation reiterating that the role of CFAC is to provide an objective information pamphlet and members personal positions on the proposed fee should not bias this process.

Ms. Little asked if the committee has had a chance to review the document prior to the meeting. Mr. Moore requested that they go through the document. Ms. Little went through the various parts of the Final Draft Information Pamphlet with the committee. She highlighted the financial analysis portion of the pamphlet which allowed for more context on the fee amount and the different tier amounts proposed and what would be provided to students. Ms. Little added that once the information pamphlet has been approved, it will be published to the website and the Daily Aztec in order to solicitate Pro/Con statements which will be incorporated into the final information pamphlet.

Ms. Little opened it up for discussion and questions. Dr. Ely asked if this fee included students enrolled in Global Campus. Ms. Little confirmed that it does not. Dr. Ely then suggested that it be made clear in the document. Ms. Little added the suggestion to the document.

Mr. Fitch suggested that the financial analysis portion of the document have clearer wording as some students may have difficulty understanding what the proposed programs are. He also pointed out that there are some portions of the chart that are very vague and would like it to be elaborated on. Mr. Fitch then added an example, where the document says expected revenue, if it is possible to put an amount there. Ms. Little responded that the current structure allows for flexibility to consider student voice in determining the discretionary allocations. She then continued that putting a specific dollar amount would limit the student's voice and the student voice is an integral part of the ongoing annual allocation process for this fee.

Ms. Oduro suggested that a section be added for the technology piece being implemented at IVC as it is known that the technology offered at main campus is different. Ms. Little stated that with the alignment of campus fees between the two campuses, the expectation is that there will be a similar level of support and services across both campuses. Mr. Sheehan echoed Ms. Little's point and added that if you look at the programs being offered, such as infrastructure changes, there are several similarities between the two campuses. Mr. Sheehan stated that programs such as e-sports that are not offered at IVC can be discussed at the forums with students to see if they would like that implemented at IVC. Ms. Oduro asked if there was any way to add this in the FAQs. Mr. Sheehan confirmed that they can do that. He also added that they can communicate verbiage on the commonalities between the two campuses and the differences.

Mr. Moore asked about the opposition section noting that the wording may come across to students as telling them that they have to vote to approve this fee rather than giving them an opportunity to formulate their own opinions. He noted that it has very strong language such as "no institutional support" resulting in some students thinking that they have no choice but to vote yes. Ms. Little thanked Mr. Moore for his suggestion and noted that she understood where he was coming from and was open to suggestions. However, she noted, that there is not currently a revenue source to fund this and absent this fee, there would be no fee revenues to support. Ms. Little does add though, that if there is a suggestion on how else

they should approach or word these, that is open for discussion. Mr. Sheehan suggested that for point 6 that instead of “no institutional support” that it be modified to something that includes factual information so to say something along the lines of “no investment in programs”. Mr. Moore suggested that the entire opposition also be looked at to include something similar to Mr. Sheehan’s suggestion. Ms. Kremicki suggested that instead of “worse staffing” that this be changed to “lower staffing ratios” and suggested to approach the opposition that way as there are other words that can be used.

Ms. Scheurmann asked about point 6 that if this fee proposal is not approved, will the University not try to seek out other funding opportunities and will these efforts then disappear. Mr. Sheehan answered that they do not have enough staff to do what is being proposed, therefore, without additional resources, it will be difficult to move forward. Ms. Scheurmann suggested that further context in point 6 be provided and if Mr. Sheehan’s point of not having enough staff could be added in that section. No further comment was given.

Mr. Fitch asked if the Office of Energy and Sustainability is being created at IV, if yes, then suggested that a note be added to inform students of this. He asked this for insurance as IV has been promised various things over the years and has yet to see those promises delivered. Mr. Hansen stated that everything under the sustainability section would be applicable to IV. He added that some points will look different such as transportation, where main campus would have trolley passes and IV would have a shuttle system. Mr. Hansen stated that the overview does state that this is for both campuses, however, if they need to reemphasize that in this section, they can. Mr. Fitch then voiced that he wants to make sure IV is not just promised these new resources, but that all these promises be put into action. Ms. Little responded that they want to look at this as one campus. Anything being implemented will happen at both campuses. She encouraged that CFAC, and the University be held accountable. If it is seen that those promises were not being met, that it be voiced and brought to the committee. Ms. Little added that it is important to have student representation from IV. Mr. Hansen echoed that and suggested that in the student voice section that we include both campuses. Ms. Little updated the pamphlet with Mr. Hansen’s suggestion. Ms. Oduro agreed with Mr. Hansen’s point and suggested we make it known that this is affecting and benefiting both campuses especially in the beginning of this transition.

Ms. Little moved on to discuss the FAQs. She suggested that due to the feedback received that someone work with Ms. Little on revising and addressing those concerns. She does note that there is a timeline on when certain processes need to be approved. Ms. Little noted that they will add an FAQ on the topics mentioned earlier. She then went through an overview of the FAQs listed in the draft pamphlet. Ms. Little also gave an overview of the operating budget and noted that the operating budget is compiled of state allocated funds and student tuition/ fees collected.

Ms. Scheurmann asked if 85% allocated to employee salary and benefits includes the administrative staff and the President. Ms. Little answered that the 85% is inclusive of all employees. This includes the various employee levels across campus. She noted that the total operating budget is half a billion dollars as it takes a significant budget to run this University and fund over 6,000 employees. Ms. Scheurmann then added that the University seems to have a lot of funds and should not default to requesting students to help fund these projects. She also added that there was an article about unused funds. Ms. Little responded that there is some misinformation surrounding the balances in the CSU which were clarified by the CO. Many of these fund balances have commitments against them and are not available to reallocate for other purposes. Additionally, these balances are one-time meaning that once they are expended, they are gone. One-time resources are not able to support ongoing costs. For this fee proposal, a reliable ongoing revenue source is needed to sustain the services and programming proposed.

Mr. Sims interjected that there was 10 minutes left in the meeting. Ms. Little added that there will be information on the website for anyone that may need accommodations and provided the links needed to access any information regarding the fee proposal and alternative consultation.

Mr. Fitch asked about the first question in the FAQs, why do we need this fee right now. He requested to see the exact investment information for HEERF. Ms. Little and Mr. Sheehan confirmed that in technology

it is about 5.6 million. Mr. Fitch suggested to add that amount into the FAQ. Ms. Little made a note to provide that information.

Ms. Little noted that this pamphlet will need CFAC approval before they can publish on the Daily Aztec in order to solicit the pro/con statements so that CFAC can approve one of each to include in the pamphlet. This will happen at the January 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. She suggested that they vote now, and the subcommittee can be tasked to continue to work on the opposition section of the document. Mr. Fitch requested that this pamphlet be worked on more as it needs a lot of adjustments in his opinion. He suggested that the subcommittee continue to work on editing this and addressing the concerns. Once everyone's concerns have been addressed, then it would be brought back to CFAC. Ms. Little stated that the timeline for the ad copy will need to be submitted by January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2022 to be published on January 19, 2022. Ms. Little asked if they would like this to be worked on again by the subcommittee then they can do that, however, she suggested doing this sooner before the holiday break.

Mr. Sims asked if Mr. Fitch is motioning to postpone approval. Mr. Fitch motioned to bring the pamphlet back to the subcommittee then presented back to the full committee for CFAC approval. Ms. Little clarified that this would mean the entire committee return during the holiday break. Ms. Oduro voiced that she was not comfortable voting on this as it is not in its final stage and does not mind meeting over the break. Ms. Little asked if the committee would be ok voting via email instead in order to be respectful and mindful of the committee members' time during the break. Mr. Moore asked for clarification on the timeline. Ms. Little clarified that this will be published on January 19<sup>th</sup> on the Daily Aztec to solicit pro/ con statements from students. They will also need this entire pamphlet available before then and published on the website as students will be direct to this document.

Mr. Sims interjected that they are almost out of time. He then asked if they decided whether they would like to motion to have this worked on by the subcommittee and brought back to the entire committee via email for a vote. Mr. Moore seconds that motion. All present members voted yes.

Ms. Little asked to receive commitment from who will be participating in the subcommittee to work on revising the pamphlet. Mr. Sheehan also asked to clarify the timeline in order to stay on track. Ms. Little proposed that the subcommittee have everything wrapped up by January 7<sup>th</sup> so that would give time to send out to the committee to vote. Mr. Fitch, Ms. Praba, Ms. Oduro, and Dr. Ely volunteered to participate. Mr. Hansen asked that the subcommittee offer suggestions on what they would like fixed rather than listing areas that they do not agree with. Ms. Oduro asked that during the subcommittee any questions they may have be addressed so that they can ensure they understand everything. Ms. Little ensured that she will be facilitating these meetings and will address any questions anyone may have. She added that if she is unable to answer, she will reach out to Mr. Sheehan and Mr. Hansen. Ms. Little asked the volunteers if they were available to meet early next week via Zoom. There were no objections. Ms. Little stated that she will be in communication with the subcommittee on the timeline in hopes to wrap this up before the holiday break. She will also email a timeline to the committee on when responses are needed.

### **Requests**

- a. None

### **New Business**

- a. None

### **Public Comment**

Mr. Sims motioned to adjourn the meeting.  
Mr. Sims adjourned the meeting at 12:05 P.M.

**Reminder:** Next meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 28<sup>th</sup>, at 11:00 A.M. via Zoom.