

**FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
November 18, 2004**

Members Present:

Jason Spencer, Co-Chair	Associated Students Representative
Jessica Jones	Associated Students Representative
Cheryl Moore	Staff Representative
Nadir Vissanjy	Associated Students Representative
Annette Powell	Associated Students Representative
Melanie Dreisbach	Chair of Academic Senate
Gregory Roberts	Senate Student Affairs Comm. Representative

Provost Ochoa attended for discussion related to IRA Eligibility

Members Absent:

Chris Fadeff	Associated Students Representative
--------------	------------------------------------

Staff Present:

Katie Pierce, Co-Chair	Committee Staff, AVP for Academic Resources
Sue Hardisty	Staff Support, Academic Affairs

Staff Absent:

Larry Furukawa-Schlereth	Committee Staff, VP for Administration & Finance
--------------------------	--

Guest:

John Scott Forrester	Professor of Art, Digital Imaging
Brad Mumaw	Associated Students Executive Vice President

**MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED**

Electronically Prior to the Meeting:

Minutes of October 28, 2004  
Agenda

At the Meeting:

Agenda (hard copy)  
“Criteria for Defining a Program as an Instructionally Related Activity”  
Copies of Art Course Fee Proposals (Art 210, Art 310, Waiver Program Subject Matter Prep Evaluation)

**MEETING AGENDA**

- I. Approval of 10/28/04 Minutes
- II. Club Teams & IRA Eligibility
- III. Art Course Fees, Forrester Time Certain: 12:40 p.m.
- IV. Associated Students Fee Increase Proposal
- V. Adjourn

Katie Pierce, Co-Chair, convened the meeting at 12:10 p.m.

**I. Approve minutes of October 28, 2004**

It was **Moved, Second, and Passed** (unanimously) to adopt the minutes of October 28, 2004 as presented.

At this point in the meeting, Provost Eduardo Ochoa arrived to participate in the discussion surrounding club teams and IRA eligibility. Katie spent a few moments introducing him to the committee members.

**II. Club Teams & IRA Eligibility**

Pierce began by giving some background information. She had recently met with Chris Fadeff and Brad Mumaw who shared with her a question from club teams about how they could be sponsored by an academic discipline or department in order to be eligible for IRA funds. An example of a club sport which is IRA eligible is Men's Lacrosse because it is affiliated with a Kinesiology activity class. Clubs such as Crew, Women's Lacrosse, Fencing and Men's Volleyball recently went to the Chair of Kinesiology and asked to be included as part of an activity class. They were declined. The Fee Advisory Committee recognizes their concerns and wonders if the Education Code 89230 and the recently adopted Criteria for Defining a Program as an Instructionally Related Activity could be interpreted to include club sports as eligible programs.

Pierce spoke with Saeid Rahimi, Dean of the School of Science and Technology, Bill Fusco, Athletic Director and Chris Canfield in the Budget Office at the Chancellor's Office for their thoughts and ideas on the topic. Canfield did not feel club sports could qualify.

Intercollegiate athletics qualifies because the teams belong to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and compete with other NCAA universities and are sponsored by an academic discipline or department.

Dean Rahimi thought there may be room for additional activity courses and will check on enrollment targets. Cost was not a major concern because volunteers could teach these courses.

Ochoa reminded the committee that retention and graduation rates are primary goals of the university and that adding courses that counter these objectives is not favorable. But if the committee wanted to investigate qualifying club sports as intercollegiate athletics, and if approved, perhaps they would want to consider increasing the fixed amount that is allocated to athletics. The question to students, then, is how set in stone is the fixed allocation to athletics?

Pierce stated that FAC would be challenged to determine all the programs that will serve the varying interests of our students.

Mumaw asked if club sports would qualify as an IRA eligible program under item H of the Criteria guidelines. Ochoa thought it did, in conjunction with item A, but the problem with H was the wording "activities associated with other instructional areas..."

Dreisbach wondered what is happening on other campuses. Pierce has inquired of Chico, but has not heard back yet.

Ochoa suggested adding an item (3) to section I. Other Programs and Considerations of the Criteria guidelines that says "Co-curricular activity that significantly enhances educational experience."

Dreisbach worried that including such a statement would open the door to all sorts of other activities wanting to be considered for IRA eligibility.

Mumaw asked what the definition of “instructional” was, asserting that learning a sport is an instructional activity.

Ochoa asked the philosophical question of whether or not the committee wants to keep a certain percentage of the funds for intercollegiate athletics or open up the funds to every kind of activity. He also stated that NCAA sports don’t serve all the students, so you could utilize clubs to enhance the educational experience.

Dreisbach said that any of the clubs could argue that they were instructional and enhanced the educational experience. Why not the chess club? She would like to find a way to fund these other activities, but to do so in a reasonable way.

**Action Taken:** Spencer offered to contact other campuses to see how they are handling the situation. Pierce will check with Dean Rahimi on the possibility of opening some more activity classes and will follow-up with the Chancellor’s Office. Ochoa will discuss the issue with Rand Link, Vice President for Student Affairs.

### III. **Art Course Fees**

John Scott Forrester gave an explanation of the nature of the courses, Art 210 and Art 310, and of the purchasing process for materials. Many of the materials could only be purchased in bulk, and it isn’t reasonable to ask students to buy such a huge amount of product when they only need a little. It’s more cost-effective to the students to let the department purchase the materials and have the students pay a course fee based on the expected per-student usage. The classes have a capacity of 14 students and are always full. Whether the classes are full to capacity, over or under capacity, the cost to the students would be the same. They would simply adjust the quantity of materials ordered to meet student needs. Art 210 and Art 310 are courses which satisfy BA and BFA requirements and are also part of the National Association for Schools of Art and Design accreditation program requirements. Other courses that satisfy the same requirement as these courses are available, so students do not have to take these courses in order to meet degree requirements. The course fee proposal is for \$62 for each course.

Moore asked if students had been surveyed to see if the fee would deter them from enrolling in the course. Forrester answered that art students are very aware of costs associated with classes and that they supported the fee because it’s actually cheaper for them in the long run. Spencer wondered at what point students would say enough is enough with all these fees. Operating expenses are being transferred to students more and more as budget cuts to departments force the implementation of course fees. If students say no to the course fees, what happens to the program?

Mumaw offered that, for qualifying students, financial aid covers course fees. Pierce stated that the proposals were consistent with the Course Fee Policy and asked for a motion.

### **Action Taken:**

It was **Moved, Second, and Passed** (unanimously) to approve the course fee proposals of \$62.00 for courses Art 210 and Art 310.

The art department also presented a fee proposal of \$50.00 for portfolio review for non-SSU students who were applying to the Single-Subject Credential Program. Currently, non-SSU graduates pay \$25 to have the Art Department chair review their portfolio with a positive evaluation resulting in waiver of the CBEST test, which costs \$41.00 and some other expenses.

Pierce reminded the committee that Foreign Language and English also charge a fee to cover costs for transcript and/or portfolio evaluation.

Forrester explained that our SSU graduates can have a portfolio review for free. The proposed fee would only apply to non-SSU graduates. The review consists of a 2-hour evaluation.

During the course of the discussion, Dreisbach questioned the waiver of the CBEST test and left the meeting to go talk with someone in the Credentials office for clarification. She returned with the correct name of the test, CSET, which can be waived through this evaluation process. She also stated that the Credentials office believes it is reasonable to charge \$50 for this evaluation.

#### **Action Taken**

Pierce will contact the Chair of the Art Department to confirm that the waiver is for the CSET not CBEST test. It was **Moved, Second, and Passed** (unanimously) to approve the course fee of \$50.00 for evaluation of student portfolios in determining eligibility to waive the CSET test.

#### **IV. Associated Students Fee Increase Proposal**

Mumaw reported that the Associated Students fee ad hoc committee is finished reviewing the proposal and the A.S. Finance committee is reviewing it. FAC should expect to receive the proposal in December. The FAC will wait until the formal proposal comes to discuss it.

#### **V. Adjourn**

Pierce adjourned the meeting at 1:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Sue Hardisty