In a good fiscal year, the Student Fee Advisory Committee, which is composed of eleven undergraduate students, including one Ex-officio SUA representative, two graduate students, one faculty member, and four staff members, is charged with ensuring the continual excellence of services, which are funded by student-paid Registration Fees (currently set at $900.00 per year/per student). In the process of making recommendations to the Chancellor, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, and the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, the Committee engages in a yearlong dialogue with student fee-funded units. Given the recent and current financial environment, the SFAC was charged to continue their campus-based fee review from last year.

In 2008-2009, committee members were asked to obtain an itemized budget of the fee, along with the fee measure language, and provide a short conclusion on the expenditure of the fee with respect to the measure language. Although limited, this process was groundbreaking because no campus unit had ever reviewed the campus-based fees. For more information on last year’s review, please see the 2008-2009 SFAC report. With this groundwork, the SFAC continued the process of review during 2009-2010.

This year we created a formal process to review the campus-based fees which was systematic and fair. At the beginning of the year, the SFAC developed multiple questions for the units to answer. The SFAC wanted to create questions that could provide quantifiable and concrete information. Not all the questions were applicable to all the fees. From our discussions, the most important thing we wanted to accomplish was to make sure the money was being used efficiently and according to measure language. Furthermore, we wanted to determine if the fees were relevant to current students’ needs. The following questions were asked of the managers:

1) Using the template(s), either attached or to follow when available, “Mandatory Student Fee Review FY 2009-10,” please provide carry-forward (Section A) and expenditure information (Section C) for the past three years’ budgets, and indicate current year plans for expenses. Please note, the Acct Codes in Section C are just place-holders. They’ll need to be over-ridden with the actual Acct Codes as reflected on the ledgers.

2) Please attach a copy of your 2009-2010 internal use operating budget for the fee. Please include all fund sources for the program supported by this fee.

3) What is your 2008-2009 carry-forward/deficit, for this fee? Please discuss intended uses of the carry-forward balance, or your plan for addressing the deficit.

4) A) How many students utilized the services funded by this fee, for the last three years? B) How many students do you expect to serve, funded by this fee, this year?

5) What direct services do you provide to students with these funds?

6) Are the services you are currently providing consistent with the original intent of the ballot language? If the services are different, please explain.

7) Please estimate what it would cost to maintain the same level of service without this campus-based fee, i.e., for you to charge a user fee rather than an across the board fee to all students.

8) What kind of outreach do you provide to students to encourage usage of your program or
service that is provided by this fee?

9) Please identify any major changes in your expenditures over the past three years, and explain them.

10) Do you have any recommendations regarding possible reduction and/or elimination of this fee? What would be the ramifications for such a change?

Along with reports that contained the answers to the questions, we had each fee administrator (and other people related to the fee) attend a meeting with the SFAC, to answer any questions that arose from the report. A list of the campus fees reviewed, as well as our outstanding observations and findings follow:

**Anonymous HIV Testing Fee**
The committee discussed SHOP’s plans to spend carry-forward funds on space improvements, i.e., office furniture, and it was determined the ballot language is not very specific as to what can and cannot be funded by the fee.

However, since the office furniture is required in order to carry out HIV testing, the SFAC recommends that SHOP use the carry-forward to purchase the proposed office equipment.

The SFAC committee will also request more specific detail about what is being planned for purchase for the new HIV/testing/advising office space.

**CARE Funds for Resource Centers**
After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

**Campus Childcare Fee**
The SFAC would like to be informed of the Early Education Services licensing review results. The SFAC also wanted to note that it is concerned with the $1.2 million deficit within EES. Other than what was mentioned, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

**Campus Programs Fee**
After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

**Campus Sustainability Program Fee**
After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

**Campuswide Student Government Fee**
The SFAC made comments about the large expenditures of funds from the Campuswide Student Government Fee. All were reasonable, explainable expenditures. The SFAC also wanted to make note of the large carry-forward of approximately $182,000.

After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.
College Student Government Fee (UG)
The SFAC would like to make note of the carry-forward of approximately $367,000.

After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

College Student Government Fee (GSA)
After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

Community and Resource Empowerment Fee
After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

Engaging Education Program Fee
The SFAC would like to make note of the fee’s carry-forward of approximately $130,000. However, the carry-forward is justified with the different projects planned to improve the Engaging Education building.

After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

Fitness Facilities Fee
After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

Graduate Student Facilities Fee
According to the ballot language, the Facilities Fee is not appropriate for funding programming, and the SFAC suggested the carry-forward funds should not be used for programming. It was recommended that the money must come from another source. Thus, money was pulled from other sources to cover past expenditures on programming and all future programming expenses.

After further reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language after the changes were made.

Intercollegiate Athletics Fee:
Ryan explained there is a need for more funding for intercollegiate athletics, and in the next five years we could see a fee referendum to increase the fee. If OPERS does initiate the referendum, the SFAC should be part of the process (as per Recommendation 3 listed above).

Intramural and Sports Club Team Fee:
The SFAC asked Ryan Andrews for examples of sports clubs that have been turned away, and Ryan said surfing, gymnastics, women’s lacrosse have been turned down, and stated that the cost to grow the program would depend of individual club’s needs. Ryan stated he will begin a survey this year for intramural participants determining the costs of participation in intramural sports. The SFAC would like to follow up on this and see the results.

Learning Support Services Fee
The SFAC noticed during the presentation that return-to-aid was up $1,353 for 2009-2010, while revenue is down $3033. Other than that observation, it was determined that the fee is being used in
accordance with the ballot language.

**Physical Education Fee**
After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

**Recreation Program Fee**
After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

**Renewable Energy Fee**
After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

**Student Facilities Fee**
The SFAC asked if there is committee oversight or an advisory board with student membership giving input on the use of the Student Facility Fee. The response was that they mainly discuss improvements with the student governments at the local level, at the colleges. The SFAC suggests they add a student representative to the Major Maintenance committee this year.

**Seymour Marine Discovery Center Fee**
After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

**Student Life Facilities Fee**
The SFAC suggests that it is included in the consultation process prior to a possible extension measure’s placement on the ballot, after the Student Life Facilities Fee’s sunset clause takes effect in 2018.

The Student Life Facilities Fee has a large carry-forward of approximately $260,000. However, due to the costs of projects for the Student Life Facilities, the carry-forward is justified.

After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

**Student Media Council Fee**
After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

**Student Voice and Empowerment Fee**
The SFAC wanted to make note of the large carry-forward of approximately $60,000. Outside of that, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

**Support GIIP:**
After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

**Sustaining the Student Media Voice Fee**
After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.
Theater Arts Fee
After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

Transportation Fee
After reviewing the ballot language, it was determined that the fee is being used in accordance with the ballot language.

Out of our discussions the SFAC decided on several recommendations. These recommendations are in no particular order:

1.) Review Measure 7, The Student Programs Fee, during 2010-2011.
2.) Elimination of large carry-forwards.
3.) Recommendations for future fee measure language.

Recommendation 1: Review Measure 7, The Student Programs Fee, during 2010-2011.

During our initial discussions to set up the process of reviewing the fees, the question came up whether or not to review Measure 7 (Student Programs Fee). The SFAC decided not to review Measure 7 this year due to time constraints. The complexity of Measure 7 requires the SFAC to set off substantial time to review the expenses of the fee. The review process should be modeled after this year’s process.

Along with the review of Measure 7, the SFAC should explore solutions to the rising costs of benefits and merits for staffing supported by the fee. As the years go by, fee revenue increases with each new increase in student enrollment numbers. However, these increases are not enough to cover staffing cost increases (including Retirement contributions). Thus, we recommend that next year’s SFAC work on coming up with recommendations to solve this structural problem.

Recommendation 2: Elimination of large carry-forwards

Many of the campus-based fee reports included budgets showing a large carry-forward. Some carry-forwards are reasonable and needed. For example, for fees that support building upgrades, multi-year savings are needed to execute upgrades, while other carry-forwards occur due to lack of usage. A few units have carry-forwards equal to a year’s worth of collected fees. The SFAC recommends the units with large carry-forwards create and deploy a plan to appropriately spend the carry-forward within the next 3 to 5 years. If a fee has a carry-forward large enough to pay for a year’s expenses, the manager of the fee should have a spending plan to reduce the carry-forward to a reasonable level.

Recommendation 3: Recommendations for future fee measure language

The next set of recommendations is for new fee measures.
A) The first recommendation is that new fee language address the problem of future increases to expenses. One example would be to include some sort of metric in the fee that is used to determine the amount charged, for example, the CPI, inflation, or increased enrollment. Another possibility is to create a fee that can be adjusted within a range, for example, The Student Programs Fee began at $44/qtr. and increased up to $51.
This recommendation was in response to the recurring theme presented by a number of units: expenses are going up, and we need to either cut back services or charge more money. A common problem we see with the current structure of some of the fee measures is the lack of a provision for funding increases in benefit, merit and retirement costs for staffing positions. A good illustration of this is Measure 7, the Student Programs Fee. The fee was charged originally at $44 per student, per quarter. However, after a year of operation, costs were higher than originally estimated, and the fee was raised to the maximum that could be charged $51. Luckily, the fee language had included a fee range and it was possible to increase the fee accordingly when necessary.

B) Another recommendation for future fee measure language is that new fees should incorporate a mandatory review clause. This clause shall state that a fee must go through a review that would look at the economic feasibility and usage of the services supported by the fee, after a specified number of years. Currently, a very small number of fees have this review process. An example is the OPERS Facilities Fee that includes a sunset clause. Without a review clause in new fees, our campus could be led to a situation where students could be paying large campus-based fees, without any possibility for the fee to be phased out or reviewed for possible reduction. For new fees that will provide services that should continue indefinitely, the mandatory review clause period presents an opportunity for the campus to review the level and usage of that particular fee.

As part of the mandatory fee review, the SFAC shall be part of the review process, providing financial recommendations to the fee administrator. With the SFAC’s knowledge and experience with campus-based fees, the recommendations will be very powerful and helpful for the fee administrator in their decisions. The fee administrator should also solicit input from other students groups (SUA, GSA, etc.) and/or students in general.

C) The last recommendation for future fees is that new measure language should be written using a glossary of terms agreed upon by students and administration. In the past, word usage in measure language led to confusion in roles, responsibility, and usage of the fee. Thus, words like “purview,” “usage,” etc. should be clearly defined in a glossary that is referred to by students writing new fee referenda.

In conclusion, the SFAC formulated several recommendations resulting from this year’s campus fee review. The committee recommends that, Measure 7, The Student Programs Fee, be reviewed in 2010-2011, and that fee administrators work to eliminate large carry-forwards. In addition, the SFAC suggests that new fee measures should include a metric to facilitate future fee increases, incorporate mandatory reviews into fee language, and utilize a glossary of key terms.