



## University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

<b>Senate Document #:</b>	11-12-12
<b>Title:</b>	Proposal to Change the Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) Operating Procedure
<b>Presenter:</b>	Rachel Cooper, Chair, Senate Student Affairs Committee
<b>Date of SEC Review:</b>	April 5, 2012
<b>Date of Senate Review:</b>	April 19, 2012
<b>Voting (highlight one):</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or</li> <li>2. In a single vote</li> <li>3. To endorse entire report</li> </ol>
<b>Statement of Issue:</b>	<p>The Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) was created by President Mote to give students an opportunity to be involved with the proposal and evaluation of student fees at the University of Maryland. At the time, UMCP was the only University System of Maryland (USM) school to have such a committee. Since 2008, this committee has evaluated fees on a bi-annual basis, evaluating mandatory fees in the fall and non-mandatory fees in the winter/spring.</p> <p>In fall 2011, Student Government Association (SGA) President Kaiyi Xie and Graduate Student Government (GSG) President Anna Bedford submitted a proposal to the University Senate requesting a review of the Committee on the Review of Student Fees, highlighting various concerns with lack of student involvement and accountability within the student-fee review process.</p> <p>The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Student Affairs Committee on October 27, 2011, with reviewing the proposal and advising on whether the current operating procedure is appropriate.</p>
<b>Relevant Policy # &amp; URL:</b>	UMCP Policy on the Review & Approval of Student Fees (no policy number or URL listed)
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<p>The Senate Student Affairs Committee approved the following recommendations to the operating procedures of the CRSF.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All units must appear annually before the CRSF and provide justification for their unit's student fees.</li> <li>2. All fee proposals must be vetted by a representative group of constituents and should include a description of that advisory</li> </ol>

	<p>group.</p> <p>3. All fee proposals should include a discussion of fee changes and a report of how enhancements were used in the prior year.</p>
<b>Committee Work:</b>	<p>The Student Affairs Committee (SAC) initially consulted with co-proposer Kaiyi Xie, an ex-officio member of SAC, to gain perspective his concerns with the current operating procedures of the CRSF. After reviewing both the University System of Maryland and University of Maryland College Park policies regarding student fees, the committee met with Robert Specter, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Robert Platky, Assistant Vice President and Director of the Office of Budget &amp; Fiscal Analysis, and Ann Wylie, Senior Vice President and Provost, to gain a better perspective of the fee review process, the history behind why the committee was created by President Mote, and its role as an advisory body to the President of the University. In addition, Specter and Platky informed the SAC of recent changes to the operating procedures of the CRSF.</p> <p>The committee also met with the proposers, Kaiyi Xie and Anna Bedford to discuss their specific concerns and the recent administrative changes to the student-fee review process and evaluate the elements of the proposal that they felt still needed to be addressed.</p> <p>The SAC reviewed the peer institution student-fee review policies and analyzed the various data collected. The SAC was in agreement that administrative changes should be made to make the student-fee review process more inclusive of students during the unit-level review process and require units to be accountable for their fee proposals and how enhancements were used. The committee also agreed to share the best practices of some exemplary fee-requesting units as an appendix to its report. The SAC met on March 5, 2012 and approved three recommendations to the operating procedures of the CRSF.</p>
<b>Alternatives:</b>	The Senate could reject the proposed changes and the current procedures would remain.
<b>Risks:</b>	If the Senate does not approve the proposed changes, the University could miss an opportunity to increase student involvement in the fee review process.
<b>Financial Implications:</b>	There are no financial implications associated with the proposed changes.
<b>Further Approvals Required:</b>	Senate Approval, Presidential Approval

# **Senate Student Affairs Committee**

**Senate Document 11-12-12**

## **Proposal to Change Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF)**

**March 2011**

### **BACKGROUND:**

The Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) was created by President Mote to give students an opportunity to be involved with the proposal and evaluation of student fees at the University of Maryland. At the time, UMCP was the only University System of Maryland (USM) school to have such a committee. Since 2008, this committee has evaluated fees on a bi-annual basis, evaluating mandatory fees in the fall and non-mandatory fees in the winter/spring.

Currently, the CRSF consists of six student members (4 undergraduate, 2 graduate), two faculty or staff members, one senator, three voting ex-officios (Vice President for Student Affairs, Dean for Undergraduate Studies, and Dean of the Graduate School), and an appointed Chair. The Vice President for Administrative Affairs, as appointed by the President of the University, traditionally serves as the Chair of the Committee, as this individual has no student fees generated by his or her office. Student members serve a one-year term that coincides with the term of the appointing authority. Faculty and staff members serve two-year staggered terms based on an academic year.

In fall 2011, Student Government Association (SGA) President Kaiyi Xie and Graduate Student Government (GSG) President Anna Bedford submitted a proposal to the University Senate requesting a review of the Committee on the Review of Student Fees, highlighting various concerns with lack of student involvement and accountability within the student-fee review process. Following a review by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) in October 2011, the proposal was charged to the Student Affairs Committee of the University Senate for further review and evaluation.

### **CURRENT PRACTICE:**

Prior to the proposal from Presidents Xie and Bedford, the Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) did not actively enforce the policy that representatives from a unit appear before the committee during the fee review process regardless of whether the unit was requesting a fee increase. The CRSF also did not have guidelines requiring that proposals provide detailed information regarding a budget breakdown, past spending, or student involvement. Lastly, the proposal states that the CRSF takes sparse minutes, making it difficult for new members to review past decisions.

Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Robert Specter and Assistant Vice President & Director of the Office of Budget & Fiscal Analysis, Robert Platky explained that the CRSF had already made several administrative changes that would address some of the issues raised by Presidents Xie and Bedford (Appendix 4). Specifically, all fee requesting units would be required

to meet with the CRSF on an annual basis, regardless of whether they were requesting an increase in their fee or not. In addition, units would have to submit a description of student involvement in the fee proposal review process. These new requirements would be enforced during the 2012 winter/spring non-mandatory fee cycle. They also noted that the CRSF has adopted Robert's Rules for small committees and its guidelines for minutes. In addition, they have set a new policy that members of the CRSF would receive materials two weeks prior to each meeting.

### **COMMITTEE WORK:**

The Senate Student Affairs Committee (SAC) was charged (Appendix 1) by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) with reviewing the proposal, "Proposal to Change Committee on the Review of Student Fees" on October 27, 2011 (Appendix 2). The SEC asked the SAC to review the proposal and advise on whether the current operating procedure is appropriate.

The SEC charged the SAC with consulting with the bill's proposers, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Rob Specter, Michele Eastman, Assistant President and Chief of Staff, and the University's Office of Legal Affairs. In addition, the committee was charged with reviewing the UMCP Policy on the Review and Approval of Student Fees (Appendix 3), the USM Board of Regents Policy on Student Tuition, Fees, and Charges (VIII-2.50), and similar policies at peer institutions.

The SAC consulted with Kaiyi Xie, one of the bill's proposers and an ex-officio member of the committee, to better understand his concerns with the current operating procedures of the CRSF. The SAC also reviewed the UMCP Policy on the Review and Approval of Student Fees and discussed whether amendments to the policy were necessary.

The SAC met with Robert Specter, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Robert Platky, Assistant Vice President and Director of the Office of Budget & Fiscal Analysis, and Ann Wylie, Senior Vice President and Provost, to gain a better perspective of both the structure of the CRSF, the history behind why the committee was created by President Mote, and its role as an advisory body to the President of the University. Michele Eastman requested that Provost Wylie speak on her behalf since she was Assistant President and Chief of Staff at the time the CRSF was created. At this meeting, Vice President Specter and Assistant Vice President Platky gave the SAC an overview of the fee review process and informed them of the recent changes to the operating procedures of the CRSF.

The SAC reviewed the USM Board of Regents Policy on Student Tuition, Fees, and Charges (VIII-2.50), which outlines the University's authority over setting student fees. The committee also met with the proposers, Anna Bedford and Kaiyi Xie, to discuss their specific concerns and the recent administrative changes to the student-fee review process, and to evaluate the elements of the proposal that they felt still needed to be addressed.

The SAC discussed the various issues raised in the proposal including whether the Chair of the CRSF should be elected or appointed, member terms, the review timeline, the contents of fee proposals, and the composition of the unit-level advisory groups. The committee also discussed whether fee proposals should include an update of previously approved enhancement requests.

Transparency of the review process including the content of the CRSF minutes and the openness of CRSF meetings were also discussed.

The SAC reviewed the peer institution student-fee review data. This analysis reviewed four of the University's peer institutions to better understand the composition of their student fee review committees. While many of the policies differed, the University of California, Los Angeles used a 2-year staggered term policy for student members of the committee.

After reviewing the peer policies and analyzing the various data collected, the committee considered possible recommendations. The SAC was in agreement that administrative changes should be made to make the student-fee review process more inclusive of students during the unit-level review process and require units to be accountable for their fee proposals and how enhancements were used. The committee also agreed to share the best practices of some exemplary fee-requesting units as an appendix to its report. (Appendix 5) Ultimately, the SAC approved three recommendations to the operating procedures of the CRSF.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

At its meeting on March 5, 2012, the Student Affairs Committee voted in favor of forwarding the following recommendations to the operating procedures of the CRSF.

1. All units must appear annually before the CRSF and provide justification for their unit's student fees.
2. All fee proposals must be vetted by a representative group of constituents and should include a description of that advisory group.
3. All fee proposals should include a discussion of fee changes and a report of how enhancements were used in the prior year.

### **APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 – Charge from the Senate Executive Committee, October 27, 2011

Appendix 2 – Proposal to Change the Committee on the Review of Student Fees


Appendix 3 – UMCP Policy on the Review and Approval of Student Fees

Appendix 4 – Updated Procedures of the Committee on the Review of Student Fees

Appendix 5 – Best Practices of Fee-Requesting Units



**University Senate  
CHARGE**

<b>Date:</b>	October 27, 2011
<b>To:</b>	Rachel Cooper Chair, Student Affairs Committee
<b>From:</b>	Eric Kasischke Chair, University Senate 
<b>Subject:</b>	Proposal to Change Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) Operating Procedure
<b>Senate Document #:</b>	11-12-12
<b>Deadline:</b>	March 30, 2012

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Student Affairs Committee review the attached proposal entitled, “Proposal to Change Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) Operating Procedure” and make recommendations on whether the CRSF operating procedures should be revised.

President C.D. Mote Jr. created the CRSF as a means to obtain student input during the process of assessing student fees. The University’s official policy on the Review and Approval of Student Fees outlines the authority for setting fees, the process for student participation, and the membership of the committee. The SEC requests that the Student Affairs Committee review the proposal and advise on whether the current operating procedure is appropriate.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Review the UMCP Policy on the Review and Approval of Student Fees.
2. Review the USM Board of Regents Policy on Student Tuition, Fees, and Charges (VIII-2.50).
3. Meet with the Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Robert Spector, or his representative to obtain an overview of the procedures utilized by the CRSF including overall timeline for its work, accountability, and transparency of the review process.
4. Meet with Michele Eastman, Assistant President & Chief of Staff, to obtain an overview of the CRSF’s advisory responsibilities to the President of the University.

5. Consult with the proposers to discuss their specific concerns about the current operating procedure of the CRSF.
6. Consult with the University's Office of Legal Affairs.
7. If appropriate, recommend how the current procedures could be revised.

We ask that you submit your report and recommendations to the Senate Office no later than March 30, 2012. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.



## University Senate PROPOSAL FORM

<b>Name:</b>	Anna Bedford, GSG President, Ex-officio senator Kaiyi Xie, SGA President, Ex-officio senator
<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Title of Proposal:</b>	Proposal to change CRSF (Committee on the Review of Student Fees) operating procedure
<b>Phone Number:</b>	
<b>Email Address:</b>	
<b>Campus Address:</b>	
<b>Unit/Department/College:</b>	ARHU, ENGR/CMNS
<b>Constituency (faculty, staff, undergraduate, graduate):</b>	Graduate & Undergraduate
<b>Description of issue/concern/policy in question:</b>	<p>CRSF is currently an advisory body with purview over changes to student fees made up of 4 undergraduate students, 2 graduate students, and 7 faculty/staff (including chair). However, there are serious flaws within the operating structure. There is a severe lack of transparency and accountability that contravenes the values of shared governance the University of Maryland and the Senate holds dear. Deliberations are all held in private, the committee is not given any way to track how student fees are being used once they have been approved, the committee cannot reduce or amend any fee proposal, even if the unit has failed to do as the committee required, and there are no clear guidelines on the amount of authority given to the committee. In addition, the chair is not an elected position within the committee but maintains a right to vote when it will make a difference. It is difficult to have a sense of the full history of the committee, because records are not well kept, however, we believe the chair has had reason to vote on several occasions, but has never voted with the majority of students. For this reason the committee is effectively constituted with a minority of student votes.</p>
<b>Description of action/changes you would like to see implemented and why:</b>	<p><i>Transparency</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Members of the committee ought be given adequate time to prepare and research the proposals. Last year they were given only 2-3 days with the binders before the meeting, which was not enough time to study the proposals or to share with their constituencies.</li> <li>- Detailed meeting minutes ought be made available to all members of the University community. Currently, only vote tallies are kept</li> </ul>



	<p>without any describing substance or context of the discussion during which the votes took place. This is particularly important for the student members who often rotate off after a year and will not have access to the history of fee discussions, such as the stated purpose for which a new fee was created.</p> <p><i>Accountability</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Each division requesting any student fees ought set up an open and transparent student advisory board that is inclusive of many different constituencies and campus governing bodies that oversees the fee proposal before it reaches CRSF. This is a policy of the CRSF but it is not enforced and several units, including Athletics, the Health Center, and Nyumburu are allowed to levy fees without giving affected constituencies a chance for input.</li> <li>- The committee ought be able to see how the previous year's student fee in a particular unit/department was spent and if it was consistent with the manner in which the fee was proposed to be spent.</li> <li>- The committee should have clearly stated guidelines in which its authority and purview is clarified, and then made available to the campus community.</li> <li>- The committee should have the power to elect its own chair in order to make the process more fair and equitable</li> </ul>
<p><b>Suggestions for how your proposal could be put into practice:</b></p>	<p>All the proposed changes are fairly simple to make and do not require heavy investments of time but simply a procedural change to how the committee is being conducted now. In addition, there are no foreseeable financial impacts of these changes being proposed.</p>
<p><b>Additional Information:</b></p>	

**Please send your completed form and any supporting documents to [senate-admin@umd.edu](mailto:senate-admin@umd.edu) or University of Maryland Senate Office, 1100 Marie Mount Hall, College Park, MD 20742-7541. Thank you!**

## UMCP Policies

### Policy on the Review and Approval of Student Fees

The purpose of this policy is to establish a procedure whereby students have an appropriate advisory role in the recommendation of student fees. Student participation is accommodated to ensure full disclosure on the appropriateness of the student fee schedule, the need for specific fees, and the cost-benefit of the fees to the student community. This participation carries with it the expectation that the process will be collaborative with broad involvement and representation and result in appropriate information sharing with the community at large.

#### **Authority for Setting Fees**

Mandatory fees and room, board and parking charges are set by the Board of Regents of the University System of Maryland (USM) as stipulated in the Policy on Student Tuition, Fees and Charges (262.0, VIII-2.50) approved by the Board of Regents, June 21, 1990.

The management of student fees, including the review and recommendation of proposed fees and the authorization of expenditures from the resulting fee revenues, is the responsibility of the President, who is advised by the President's Cabinet. The Cabinet is advised by the Committee for the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) on recommendations for proposed fees.

#### **Process for Student Participation**

Mandatory fees and room, board and parking charges will undergo a five-step process:

- (1) The unit proposing the fee provides an opportunity to the affected student constituency for discussion on the merits and impact of the fee.
- (2) The Committee for the Review of Student Fees reviews the proposed fee and makes a recommendation to the Cabinet.
- (3) The Cabinet reviews the fee proposal and the recommendation made by the Committee to Review Student Fees and make a recommendation to the President.
- (4) The President recommends the fee schedule to the USM Board of Regents.
- (5) Board of Regents approves the fees.

In the event that actions by the State or Board of Regents with fiscal implications to the operations funded by the fees occur late in the process, it may be necessary that the fee submission be modified by the President.

**Committee for the Review of Student Fees**

The Committee for the Review of Student Fees shall be comprised of thirteen individuals.

**Members**

**Appointing Authority**

Chair	President of the University
Vice President Student Affairs	Ex officio, voting
Dean, Undergraduate Studies	Ex officio, voting
Dean, Graduate School	Ex officio, voting
4 undergraduate students	President of the Student Government Association
2 graduate students	President of the Graduate Student Government
2 faculty or staff	President of the University
1 Senator	Chair of the University Senate

Normally the Chair is the Vice President for Administrative Affairs. Student members serve a one-year term that coincides with the term of the appointing authority. Faculty and staff members serve two-year staggered terms based on an academic year.

Approved by the President on 10/24/08



# UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

DEPARTMENT OF BUDGET AND FISCAL ANALYSIS

2132 Main Administration Building  
College Park, Maryland 20742-5035  
301.405.5627 TEL 301.314.9519 FAX

MEMO TO: Fee-Proposing Unit Representatives

FROM: Robert A. Platky  
Director of Budget & Fiscal Analysis

SUBJECT: Follow-Up to Fall 2011 Mandatory Student Fee Review Process

DATE: November 30, 2011

Attached for your information is a copy of the final draft of the minutes of the September 23, 2011, meeting of the Committee for the Review of Student Fees. The Cabinet and President subsequently endorsed the Committee's recommendations and the fee proposals have been forwarded to USM for approval by the Board of Regents.

As further follow-up to this fall's Mandatory Student Fees recommendation process, the Committee provides the following additional guidance to fee-proposing units ("proposers"):

1) Regardless of the amount of the fee proposal, including those that are unchanged, proposers *must* provide a complete and accurate fee proposal to the Committee. Proposers should submit all required data schedules and ensure that the information is complete and ties to FRS data; this is especially important because the Budget & Fiscal Analysis staff has only a few days following the due date to compile the various fee proposals and prepare the materials for distribution to the Committee.

2) Current policy requires that "the unit proposing the fee provide an opportunity to the affected student constituency for discussion on the merits and impact of the fee" (Policy, Process for Student Participation, (1)). To ensure that student stakeholders are robustly engaged, proposers will from now on be required to include in their fee proposal a clear description of the student consultation process. It should include how students are selected for involvement, how many students are engaged and the character of the discussions.

3) Regardless of the amount of the fee proposal, including those that are unchanged, proposers *must* attend or have representation at Committee meeting(s) to present the proposal and to respond to questions and concerns of the Committee. Proposers should be prepared to respond to questions about the use of fee proceeds, necessity for a change in the amount of the fee (if any), and the portion of the program/activity expense that is partially or fully fee supported.

Your assistance in ensuring a thorough and meaningful review and approval process for student fees is very much appreciated. Please let either committee chairman Rob Specter or me know if you have any questions or concerns regarding this guidance.

cc: Committee Members

## APPENDIX 5

### BEST PRACTICES OF FEE-REQUESTING UNITS

The Student Affairs Committee discussed the review processes of several fee-requesting units at the University. The committee noted that broad representation of the student body on the unit-level advisory committees, inclusive of graduate and undergraduate students, was an important element of the review process. Units that do not have an existing structure of student groups (i.e. RHA, CTAC) to populate their advisory groups could use the Graduate Student Government (GSG) and Student Government Association (SGA) to assist them in forming their unit-level review committees. The Presidents of these organizations can be contacted at [gsg-president@umd.edu](mailto:gsg-president@umd.edu) or [SGApresident@umd.edu](mailto:SGApresident@umd.edu). In addition, the committee noted that some units provided more detailed overall budget information in their fee proposals.

The committee offers the following best practices of some of the University's fee-requesting units as a guide for other units:

#### **Mandatory Fees Summary**

CAMPUS RECREATION – Fees are reviewed by the Campus Recreation Advisory Board, which includes representatives from the Student Government Association (SGA), Graduate Student Government (GSG), Residence Hall Association (RHA), Off Campus Student Association, and the student appointee from the Vice President of Student Affairs. Individual meetings are also held with the SGA and GSG presidents.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES (DOTS) (SHUTTLE) – Meetings are held individually with SGA, GSG and RHA leaders. Fees are then reviewed by the Campus Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), which includes representation from SGA and GSG.

THE ADELE H. STAMP STUDENT UNION, UNDERGRAD STUDENT ACTIVITIES, GRAD STUDENT ACTIVITIES – The Center for Campus Life has a Stamp Advisory Board serving as its oversight group. This group approves the annual budget and also reviews and approves any fee increases. It is also the group that reviews our policies and services (including approving any new policies, building vendors, or major building changes). The Stamp Advisory Board meets bi-weekly and has voting, non-voting, and ex-officio members. The voting membership includes students, alumni, faculty, staff, ex-officio staff. The majority of the members of this board are students that are appointed by the Student Government Association (SGA), Graduate Student Government (GSG), and Student Entertainment Events (SEE), in addition to several at-large students. In presenting the fee request, Stamp leadership details its fee requests for the Stamp, the Graduate Student Activities Fee, Undergraduate Student Activities

Fee, and SEE monies (portion of the Undergraduate Student Activities Fee), and the Graduate Legal Aid Fee (portion of the Graduate Student Activities Fee). SGA and GSG are charged with approving any changes to the respective student activities fee prior to review in the Stamp Advisory Board. Stamp is most interested in having the Stamp Fee reviewed. The Stamp Advisory Board reviews the budget in the spring so that we are building on the information our board has on the financial status of the Stamp when it reviews the fee increases in the fall. The advisory board reviews all of the various supporting documents including projected income, operating budget, proposed enhancements, and adjustments and increases related to enrollment. All questions are answered and the group discusses the proposal and makes alterations when needed. The Stamp Advisory Board then votes on its outcomes before presenting the fee proposal to the Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF).

### **Non-Mandatory Fees Summary**

DEPARTMENTS OF RESIDENT LIFE AND RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES – The Directors of Resident Life and Residential Facilities engage the Residence Hall Association (RHA) in a review of the student fee proposal annually. The process involves first presenting the fee request to the 54-member RHA Senate and responding to any questions or concerns at that meeting. The Directors then meet with the respective RHA advisory groups (RELATE and REFAB) to further discuss the proposal and gain their feedback. The advisory groups develop a resolution for RHA regarding the proposed fee increase. The RHA Senate then votes on whether they endorse the fee request. Adjustments to the fees can be made at any time during this process.

DINING – Fee proposals are reviewed by the Dining Student Advisory Board and then a presentation is made to the entire Residence Hall Association (RHA).

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES (PARKING) – The department meets individually with SGA, GSG, and RHA leaders. The proposal is then reviewed by the Campus Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), which includes representation from SGA and GSG. DOTS also includes charts and graphs showing overall budget areas in their fee proposals.

## **MINORITY REPORT**

University of Maryland Senate  
Student Affairs Committee

### **Minority Report**

Bill ID 11-12-12

Proposal to Change the Committee on the Review of Student Fees Operating Procedure

#### ***Introduction***

On March 5, 2012, the Senate Student Affairs Committee (SAC) voted (7 for and 5 against) to recommend three items for consideration in response to Senate Bill 11-12-12, submitted by Graduate Student Government President Anna Bedford and Student Government Association President Kaiyi Xie.

We respectfully and strongly dissent from the majority decision of the Committee. In addition, we would like to emphasize that of those members who attended and voted on March 5, upon some members' reconsideration due to various issues surrounding the meeting and the votes (discussed infra), if the same vote were taken today, the proposed changes would not pass out of Committee.

#### **We recommend:**

- **that the three SAC recommendations in response to Bill 11-12-12 be returned to SAC for additional deliberation and analysis.**
- **that Bill 11-12-12 be recommitted to the SAC for additional consideration.**
- **that the SAC include additional avenues of student input in the deliberative process on Bill 11-12-12.**

#### ***Overview of Concerns***

This report highlights three broad concerns:

1. Inadequate Committee proceedings
2. Insufficient fulfillment of the SEC charge
3. Incomplete proposed recommendations

#### ***Concerns with Committee Proceedings***

The Student Affairs Committee failed to sufficiently evaluate all concerns surrounding the proposed recommendations due to two reasons: timing and confusion. We believe that it is simply undisputed by anyone on the Committee that this meeting lacked one essential element—time. Pressured by a lack of time, the Committee hastily voted on many matters, including actions to proceed following the meeting. Members were confused about the options moving forward and thus could not effectively choose whether to submit recommendations, request an extension, or schedule an additional Committee Meeting.

In its entirety, the final meeting of the SAC was unnecessarily constrained by time. The meeting and discussion was cut short by 25% due to the Chair's tardy arrival. Many Committee members' schedules prohibited the meeting from lasting past the 12 pm ending time, leaving the Committee without quorum and thus a true ability to act after only 45 minutes. Of the 45 minutes, the initial 15 were spent discussing the fee review process at peer institutions (an agenda item previously left unaddressed due to time constraints at a prior meeting). The remaining 30 minutes had to be divided between proposing recommendations, discussing improvements to recommendations, approving recommendations, and procedural measures. As soon as the time constraint arose as an eminent issue, the remainder of the meeting time was spent discussing options for further action.

While we reviewed past meetings, the Committee thought about the objective to make recommendations. While we made recommendations, the Committee thought about the objective to meet time constraints. While we worried about time constraints, the Committee thought about what to do when we ran out of time. Never did the Committee's objectives address the current matter at hand. Never did the Committee have enough time to fully consider revisions. Never did the Committee finish proposing recommendations.

Though the Committee's decision to put forth the recommendations was made with a constitutional majority, we believe that this decision was flawed due to insufficient information and understanding. It was the general sentiment that it was better to have something rather than nothing in the final few minutes of the Committee, before quorum disappeared. This did not leave sufficient opportunity for those opposed to bringing forth the recommendations to state their objections, and it was also clear to all members of the Committee that members still had much to discuss on the issue.

We believe that in a truly democratic process, a small majority ought not trump the rights of a minority to further discuss the issues, especially when much of the Committee has not been given the chance to fully understand the situation and alternatives. The principles of shared governance dictate that in order to fully flesh out an issue, sufficient time must be given to the actual analysis of the issues after fact-finding is completed. During this meeting, little to no chance was given to synthesize together the information collected previously over many months. In fact, due to time concerns, the Committee was led directly to making recommendations. Little guidance from Committee leadership was offered regarding the fact that there were viable alternatives to the action the Committee took. In fact, the Committee chair vocally stated her support for sending forth the recommendations in their current form. As a result, not all Committee members understood that other alternatives remained. Just because some supported the three recommendations that resulted from this meeting, this does not mean they considered the issues completely resolved.



The final Committee Report of the majority states: “After reviewing these policies and analyzing the various data collected, the committee considered possible recommendations.” We find it incredibly far-fetched to claim that in the sole post-fact-finding meeting, which was cut short by 25%, any actual analysis of the data took place. With the knowledge that the Committee was short on time, Committee members leapt to moving potential recommendations to the floor.

### ***Fulfillment of SEC Charge to SAC***

In order to completely and effectively fulfill a Committee charge, sufficient consideration and deliberation, as is consistent with the democratic process, should be given to all aspects of the proposal. Recommendations should not be taken simply as individual items, but as sums of the whole. The amount of time and effort dedicated to researching and gathering information on current policies is critical, but attempting to synthesize such information in such a limited time frame is unrealistic. Shortchanging deliberation in an effort to fulfill a charge is not completing the given charge at all. This harms further consideration of the unresolved recommendations by insinuating that the Committee had contemplated such recommendations and decided against advancing them.

### ***Concerns with Proposed Recommendations***

Each of the three recommendations was approved with large majorities. However, the crux of the issue lies in the fact that Committee members were not expecting that there was time for only 3 recommendations, and no more time to proceed further with discussing others. Thus, support for the 3 current recommendations is not analogous to support for *only* these 3 recommendations—there were many questions left unanswered that merit discussion. Thus, we feel that these three recommendations, *prima facie*, are insufficient in addressing the issues brought up in Bill 11-12-12 and addressing the Senate Executive Committee’s charge.

### ***Additional Recommendations***

We feel that the following have not been addressed in the current recommendations:

- The definition and role of a student fee (what normatively does and does not constitute an appropriate use of fee monies).
- Sufficiency and type of financial information available to unit-level fee review bodies.
- What constitutes a sufficient unit-level fee review body.
- The transparency and operating rules of the actual Committee for the Review of Student Fees (CRSF).
- The procedures of electing a chair of CRSF.

We feel that the aforementioned are essential to a complete discussion on Bill 11-12-12. The fact that the SAC did not adopt or reject any of the aforementioned, even though they were featured prominently in the fact-finding phase of the Committee's actions, elucidates truly how limited in scope the 3 recommendations are. In fact, the SAC failed to even broach these topics in its meeting due to time constraints.

### ***Conclusion***

Despite an initially vague charge, the substantive and detailed research in conjunction with the lack of any discussion or stance on the aforementioned recommendations is clearly indicative of the incomplete assessment of the proposal and issue as a whole.

### ***Signatories***

Whitney Beck  
Madison Ferraro  
Stephanie Graf  
An Hoang  
Brandon Levey  
Kaiyi Xie