

Student Fee Advisory Committee

February 12, 2016

Meeting Minutes

Present: Sherwynn Umali, Alexander Li, Matthew Tsai, Valerie Sanchez, Kim Sadler, Kristine Jermakian, Chance Pardon, Will Devanny, Liuyi Pei, Haruka Hatori

Absent: Felicia Martinez, Parshan Khosravi

Staff: Karen Mizumoto

1. January 29, 2016 meeting minutes approved.
2. Survey Management Recap/Student Priorities
 - a. Concern that the response from underrepresented students is still very low and decisions on funding recommendations shouldn't be made if not all students are represented in the survey results.
 - b. Committee needs to work on finding out why some students aren't participating in the survey and develop a better plan to reach these students.
 - c. There will not be enough time this year before the survey needs to close to determine why some students are unresponsive; the committee can work on this later this year and work on creating more effective publicity strategies for next year's survey.
 - d. The committee will continue outreach efforts including intentional publicity geared towards specific cross-cultural groups on campus and keep the survey open for an extended period. Additional marketing will include:
 - i. Identifying student groups to target (Kristine and Matt).
 - ii. SL&L will work with campus orgs to send survey info/links to their members.
 - iii. Invite representatives who are familiar with specific groups on campus to meet with the committee.
 - iv. AGS can work with secretaries in departments to send an email out to students.
 - e. Because the survey may not represent all groups on campus, the survey results shouldn't be used to weight which student services and programs are most important to students.
 - f. The survey may not give a true picture of how important student services/facilities are to students.
 - g. The determination of students' highest priorities and areas of need will not be based entirely on the survey; the committee members can also add their own input.
 - h. The committee decided not to use survey results to weight determination of student priorities.
 - i. The categories used to sort the requests last year were fairly broad and touched on many areas of campus life; they also helped the subcommittees to focus of proposals within the categories that they were reviewing (rather than having to review all proposals).
 - j. Categorization depended on the requests being made rather than the department/unit making the request. Some requests touched multiple categories.
 - k. Last year's categories:
 - i. Student Life and Leadership

- ii. Mental Health
- iii. Campus Climate
- iv. Academic/Non-academic and Career Counseling
- 1. Karen will summarize funding requests so the committee can sort and categorize requests into the same categories that were used last year.

3. Referenda Review

- a. The SFAC will be reviewing ballot language to make sure language meets campus policy/guidelines requirements including amount of fee, to which students the fee will be applicable, which terms/quarters the fee will be charged, sunset clauses and reaffirmation (where applicable), CPI escalators, etc.
- b. The committee will not be endorsing the referenda or making recommendations on the referenda. The committee will also not be commenting on the merits of the proposed fee.
- c. Student Center
 - i. Continuation of portion of the fee (\$47.50 per quarter fee) set to retire in 2017 when applicable portion of the debt (phase 3) is retired.
 - ii. The last sentence of the third paragraph seems confusing and repetitive. Can the last sentence be revised/merged with the second sentence?
 - iii. Original referendum did not escalate to cover cost increases and inflation. Fee revenue will be used for building operations and maintenance.
 - iv. Sunset and reaffirmation language is confusing; phrasing should be reversed with the language regarding the fee sunset to be stated first and then information about the reaffirmation vote should follow. This should be revised in all referenda.
- d. WHC
 - i. \$57.00 per quarter fee to support the debt repayment and then ongoing building operations and maintenance.
 - ii. When debt expires, fee level will be reduced to approximately \$24.00 per quarter fee.
 - iii. Why is there no sunset? The portion of the fee supporting the debt will end when debt is fully repaid. The remaining portion will not sunset because there needs to be a steady source of funds to keep the building operational.
 - iv. There should be information on how much the building will cost and how much of the cost will be supported by the fee. Students might be more supportive of the fee if they know how much of the cost they are funding and how much of the cost will be funded by other (non-student fee) sources.
 - v. Even though the exact timeframe for the debt repayment is not known, students may be more supportive if they can get an idea of how long they will be paying the fee. Some estimated timeframe should be included in the referendum.
 - vi. An estimated amount of CPI should be provided so students get an idea of how much the fees will increase (this should be provided for all referenda).
 - vii. It would be helpful to meet with Student Affairs staff familiar with this referendum. Karen will contact VC Parham's office to invite SA staff to the next meeting.
- e. General questions

- i. Why do some fee referenda include 33% return to aid others include 25% RTA.
- ii. CPI estimate should be included in all referenda.
- iii. Sunset and reaffirmation language should be switched in all applicable referenda.

4. Meeting adjourned.