

Student Fee Advisory Committee MINUTES

March 17, 2023 @ 11am
BH-250

In attendance: Beth Lesen, Norbert Schurer, Milton Ordonez, Praveen Soni, Marianne Hata, Kristin Bonetati, Isaac Julian (student), Anthony Regina (student), Kayla Brooks (student), Jeremy Ramos (student), Jocelyn – on behalf of Diamond Byrd (student), Nicholas (student – D49er). In addition, Sylvana Cicero and Joe Nino attended as members of the community and so did Suzie Payne, Veronica Hernandez, and Melissa Norrbom Kawamoto as support staff.

1. Welcome

Beth Lesen, Chair

Beth Lesen began the meeting at 9:06am. It was noted that the Student Fee Advisory Committee is a recommending body for fees proposed to President Conoley. The committee includes representatives from a cross-section of the university to represent different stakeholder groups and is a consultative body gathered for the purpose of shared governance.

2. Instructional Related Activities Fee (cont.)

Ted Kadowaki, Athletics joined by Katie Burd and Liana Marin as well as students Katie Kennedy, Malia Talavou, Keeley Rasmussen, and Bryce Kwick.

Purpose: Conclude the alternative consultation process for a proposed increase to the IRA Fee

Ted Kadowaki presented the final report on the alternative consultation process (attach presentation) including a timeline of the process, details regarding the survey administration, some of the survey questions and comments, and what items the proposed allocation would contribute to. Ted commented on a FAQs section of the Beach Athletics website that was created to increase transparency and address feedback from the Fee Advisory Committee.

Ted noted that if the fee were approved, this would contribute to \$4.8 million in IRA fees

- ASI's current contribution is approx. \$445,000 (mostly for scholarships)
- SEF's current contribution is approx. \$3.2 million (mostly for scholarships)
- This fee is intended to cover mostly team travel, nutrition, mental health, and equipment.

Kristen B Question – What is being charged to the student currently to support Athletics? And what would the \$64 be added to?

Response:

- Currently, the Athletics fee is \$34 per student and \$2 per semester from the \$25 IRA fee goes towards Athletics.
- \$34 (Current Fee) + \$64 (IRA Fee) would equal a total of \$98 to Athletics

The Student Athletes provided commentary in support of the fee:

- Student athletes feel campus pride representing the student body at sporting events
- As students, they feel more connected to CSULB at athletic events and games
- Despite our athletic program having smaller budget than other D1 schools, Beach Athletes compete at the top of their class. Our students are All-American award winning athletes and we have multiple teams competing in the 25 of their sport. Last year, CSULB won the Commissioners Cup.
- Not supporting this fee will impact the type of athletes who want to come and compete here.
- One of the students transferred from another D1 and commented that in comparison, our athletics program deeply cares about the health and well-being of student athletes far more than other institutions with twice the fiscal resources.
- One student athlete noted that she tried her best to separate her bias and evaluate the fee based on a student vs. a student athlete and still feels she would make the choice to support the fee increase

Anthony Question – What are the long term outcomes if this fee is not approved or passed?

Response – Possible reductions in athlete scholarships, reducing staffing, reduction of health and wellness programs and it will also make it very difficult to recruit a competitive Athletics Director for the program

Kristin B. Question – What money is being used to upkeep the facilities currently?

Response – Deferred maintenance is a large issue on some of the facilities, but this \$4.8 million fee increase would not be used for facilities.

Athletics representatives and Nicholas (D49er) left the meeting.

Discussion among the Committee

- Anthony suggested not to approve the full \$64 fee increase, but to consider a \$40 fee increase instead. Several other student representatives agreed. Multiple committee members strongly advised a lesser fee.
- Isaac was still concerned with lack of transparency and felt the survey questions were somewhat leading in favor of athletics with the way they were worded.
- Kristin mentioned that the breakdown of funds seemed to be missing itemization for some of the larger allocations.
- Marianne expressed concerns that it seemed Athletics didn't go beyond soliciting input from students beyond student athletes other than at Week of Welcome.
- Beth noted that the total number of student athletes is approximately 400.
- Norbert insisted that the survey should not carry much weight or influence because it was poorly constructed and did not discuss how the fee would impact other students besides student athletes. Norbert was not convinced that the group showed evidence that athletics

contributes to campus diversity and was disappointed that alternative funding models were not investigated or explored.

- Milton commented that in general the campus tends to wait until fiscal problems have arisen before trying to address them.
- Beth mentioned that most fee increases do not come with cost of living increases and so over time they are unable to make up for the increased costs of expenditure.
- Sylvana mentioned that this opportunity is Athletics trying to 'course correct' and commented that athletics does contribute to sense of community and sense of belonging on campus. The impact is not global, but larger than just the students who go to games.
- Marianne questioned if IRA was the right funding source for this need and asked what pot of money should address this need? Is IRA the right funding source?
- Jocelyn added that the survey was difficult for students to find and that by catching students' attention with the giveaways, there was a perception they weren't being very transparent with the fee. Jocelyn proposed a gradual increase.

Out of 7 voting members present, 2 voted in favor of recommending the fee and 5 were opposed to recommending the fee.

3. **Adjournment at 12:09pm**