

# STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## Minutes

Friday, February 19, 2016

9:00 a.m. · USU – 205

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

Vice President Carmen Taylor, Chair of the Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. and welcomed the Committee members.

### 2. Approval of Agenda and Minutes

The Committee reviewed the agenda for the meeting; it was approved with none opposing. The Committee also reviewed the minutes of the December 4, 2015, meeting. The minutes were approved as is with none opposing.

### 3. Student Health Services/Division of Student Affairs

Mary Ann Takemoto, Associate Vice President, Student Affairs, and Director, Student Health Center (SHC), followed up on her presentation to the Committee on December 4, 2015, by providing a brief overview of the request to increase the two existing Category II Fees: the SHC Fee and the SHC Facility Fee. Takemoto reiterated that the CSULB SHC Fee is the lowest currently charged in the CSU system, and the average fee charged in the CSU is nearly triple what CSULB currently charges. Takemoto explained that to continue the current level of services offered at the SHC with an increase in counseling services, the SHC Fee needs to increase to \$75 per semester, or \$150 per year. To offer enhanced medical services, such as dermatology, allergy, and optometry services, the SHC Fee needs to increase to \$90 per semester, or \$180 per year. In addition, there is a request to include a Consumer Price Index (CPI) inflation adjustment to SHC Fee every three years. The SHC Facility Fee is requested to increase from \$6 per semester, or \$12 per year, to \$10 per semester, or \$20 per year. The fee for the summer session would remain the same and would not increase.

Takemoto introduced a few speakers to speak on behalf of the SHC, including Nikki Estanol, ASI Senator, and Cindy Masner, Associate Director of Athletics at CSULB. Wendy Lewis asked what percentage of the SHC budget goes to salaries. Takemoto responded that it is more than 95% while the CSU average is 82%. Lewis also asked whether the SHC Facility Fee increase was separate from the SHC Fee increase. Takemoto explained that the two fees and requests for increase were indeed separate. Gary Griswold asked if the increase in counseling services would be in collaboration with CAPS. Takemoto responded that yes, it would be. Jose Salazar noted that the increase in the SHC fee is more than what an annual CPI increase would have been over the same time period. Carmen Taylor explained that while the CPI is a good measure, the SHC deals with actual costs, and the University cannot compete with salary against the private sector. Salazar requested more information on what the increase in counseling services would entail. Takemoto replied that there would likely be 2-3 additional counselors hired as well as a case manager. Sharon Taylor asked for a future budget based upon the proposals. Norbert Schurer asked what percentage of the operating budget comes from the SHC fee. Carmen Taylor stated that all of the budget for SHC comes from the student health center fee.

Carmen Taylor explained that the Committee had four options for action regarding the SHC:

- a. Recommendation of the amount of the fee increase for the Student Health Center Fee and Facility Fee
- b. Recommendation on the implementation term and whether it is phased in.
- c. Recommendation whether to have a student fee referendum or alternative consultation.

- d. If the recommendation by the committee supports a process to increase either or both fees; establishment of subcommittee to conduct the recommended course for a fee referendum or alternative consultation.

Carmen Taylor asked for a vote of those supportive of the SHC fee increase of \$75 per semester. Schurer motioned, Lewis seconded, and the Committee approved the fee increase of \$75 with none opposing. Sharon Taylor noted that backup material would have to be provided to the President to gain support. She also suggested that the Committee drop consideration of the \$90 per semester fee as there seemed to be little support.

Griswold asked if the SHC Facility Fee would need to be approved by the Chancellor's Office. Sharon Taylor explained that it would not; the President has the authority to approve as it is a Category II fee. Salazar asked if there was only one option for the SHC Facility Fee. Lewis suggested that two options for the Facility Fee be forwarded: \$8 and \$10. Salazar motioned, Lewis seconded, and was approved with none opposing.

Carmen Taylor asked the Committee to consider whether they wanted to move forward with the alternative consultation process. Miriam Hernandez motioned, Lewis seconded, and the motion carried unopposed.

A subcommittee was created consisting of Nancy Eckhous, Jordan Eres, Gary Griswold, Jose Salazar, Norbert Schurer, and Sharon Taylor to conduct the recommended course for alternative consultation.

The question was raised as to whether the fee increase should be implemented or phased in. Salazar suggested the phasing in process. Eres motioned, Lewis seconded, and the motion passed unopposed.

#### **4. College of the Arts Fee Request**

Dr. Brian Crockett and Dr. Brittany Ransom from the College of the Arts provided a presentation regarding their request to establish a new Category III Fee for ART 363C - \$75 Digital Fabrication Lab Course Supplies Fee. Wendy Lewis motioned, Jose Salazar seconded, and the motion passed unopposed.

#### **5. Associated Students Inc./University Student Union**

Sylvana Cicero presented to the Committee on behalf of ASI and the USU a request to modify the University Student Union fee for the Referendum-required Inflationary CPA Adjustment. Salazar motioned, Eres seconded, and the motion passed unopposed.