

**Notes**  
**Shared Governance/Transparency Subcommittee Call**  
**October 8, 2018**

Present: Melissa Seixas, Chair; Kayla Rykiel, Nicole Washington

**I. Call to Order**

The meeting began at 1:01 p.m.

**II. Fee Structure Update**

Mr. Trivunovich explained that he has been working with Dean McDonald's team/counterparts and SGA presidents across all campuses to come up with a potential recommendation for the committee's consideration.

The recommendation discussion centered on the transition to a consistent set of student fees across all campuses. This would also include the provision of equitable services. Equitable services does not mean the exact same services on each campuses but making available services more accessible in an equitable way to all students. Currently, there are limitations on participation in non "home" campus activities.

Within the discussion regarding a consistent student fee, there are some items that will require consideration:

1. The initial target date for one student fee is July 1, 2020. All students enrolled prior to that date would be grandfathered in under the now existing fee structure. The grandfathering allowance would sunset four years after the consolidation date to move all students to one system.

Chair Seixas asked for further clarification regarding equitable access to services. Mr. Trivunovich noted that campuses currently vary by service and that equitable access would maintain current services while providing some accessibility to student services at other campuses (e.g. student health at USFSM). The challenge is determining how those services are provided (e.g. transportation provision). The overall result could be an increase of services to all students. The physical locations would still dictate actual services but the focus would be on how to make those services accessible to all

2. Certain fees support campus specific facilities fee (Marshal Student Center and the USFSP student center) and it remains to be determined how these could be maintained under a uniform, single. There was discussion around whether facility specific fees could be encompassed within another fund. However, these facility specific fees are pledged to the bonds on both student centers. This creates a commitment to the bondholders that the fees that are charged will pay off that specific debt. Eventually this debt will pay itself out. Ms. Washington requested a phase out timeline and information regarding if/how other SUS entities have similar issues.

3. In finalizing a student government structure that could exist under one set of student fees, it is important to adhere to the principal of equal representation for all campuses. Student government advisors are still working on this recommendation and are looking at various models. One option is allowing all A&S fees to fund one pool with a combined student government. The combined SGA would then allocate funds. Another option is to divvy up an amount of funds to each campus and allow individual campus leadership control over use and allocation. A concern regardless of model is that fees remain at a level that allows for current campus budget amounts to be realized so that existing services are maintained. There was concern to avoid any adverse effects on a regional campus through an increase in fees. SGA budgeting process could follow a single fee structure in that it be centralized or via overall fund to individual campus for allocation.

Members discussed whether the tuition differential could allow for a main campus credit hour fee with differentiation between regional campuses that may allow for uniform reporting at the BOG level but maintain some flexibility at the local level. FAU and FIU have multiple campuses and their fees and access to services are, for the most part, consistent. FSU has the Panama City campus that does maintain a different fee schedule. Mr. Trivunovich does not believe the access to services is the same for Panama City but will verify. Members discussed looking at the overall cost structure and stressing a transparent fee process but also keeping in mind the potential impact on regional campuses.

Chair Seixas is most concerned with the regional campuses and how a single fee structure may impact them in terms of services. The challenge is trying to focus on the future student and not just today's reality. Members communicated concerns on the reality of access in terms of students actually using services on other campuses. A student survey regarding use of services was suggested to better inform decisions. Again, the challenge is asking current students about future changes. The law does not require a single fee structure and would allow the Task Force to make a recommendation either way.

Chair Seixas suggested focusing on recommendations that do not require additional discussions while recognizing fee structure is not an easy issue. The members will provide specific requests for follow-up. (Both Chair Seixas and Ms. Washington had to leave the call at 1:35 p.m.).

There was discussion regarding how to recommend a single fee structure or realize the cost/benefit of one without an absolute on a transportation structure. There are examples of where programs are not physically located on the Tampa campus and are either paying and not using or paying and figuring out how to use services.

### **III. Adjournment**

With no other discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 1:43 p.m.