

Report for Committee on Student Affairs for Faculty Senate Newsletter

February 2, 2012

In the Fall of 2011, the Committee on Student Affairs, along with the Committee on Athletics, was charged with reviewing how the Student Athletic Fees are spent and the impact of the mandatory fee on student attendance at athletic events.

- A. The chair met with Jan Javinar, Director of Co-Curricular Activities who reported the following:**
- 92% of the Athletic Fee (\$879,920 – 2010-2011) is controlled by the Athletics Department**
 - 8% of the Athletic Fee (\$70,394 – 2010-2011) is controlled by The Student Athletic Fee Committee.**

(The Student Athletic Fee Committee is made up of: undergraduate representatives, graduate representatives, representatives of chartered organizations (RIOs), and student athletes.)

The 8% given to the Student Athletic Fee Committee is used for:

- 4% used for increasing student attendance at athletic events by:
Enhancing the student experience at athletic events by providing free parking, snacks, tailgate activities at events**
 - 4% for enhancing campus life in general. Under this provision, the Student Athletic Fee Committee solicited applications from campus organizations for use of this fee.**
- B. The committee invited representatives of the Athletics Department and the Vice Chancellor for Students Office to come to the committee meeting to present information about how the 80% of the Fee are being utilized. On November 10, 2011, Associate Vice Chancellor Alan Yang and Dean of Students Lori Ideta, and Carl Clapp, Associate Director of Athletics attended the meeting and addressed the questions that the committee raised. Carl Clapp reported that the majority of the money from the fee is used for Student-Athlete Travel.**
- C. The chair met with Kelly Withy, Chair of the Committee on Athletics, and was informed that that committee had met with student athletes and that they were happy about the use of the fee!**
- D. At the Committee Chair Retreat, the issue of student satisfaction of this arrangement (beyond the student athletes) had yet to be assessed. Therefore, the suggestion was that the CSA meet with representatives of the ASUH (President Anna Koethe) and GSO (President –Anjali Nath) to determine if they would like to survey the undergraduate students and graduate students to ascertain their feelings about this mandatory fee.**

- E. After communicating with Bonnyjean Manini, who works with those two student organizations, it was felt that ASUH and GSO would be interested in surveying students through MYUH during registration. Even though this survey may not result in a rescinding of this mandatory fee, the data would be useful when the issue of the fee and tuition increases arise and the students meet with the BOR.
- F. The Chair met with ASUH President Anna Koethe and she invited a representative from the CSA to the ASUH Senate meeting to discuss the possibility of the survey.
- G. Anna Koethe subsequently informed the Chair that ASUH would conduct the survey with students and would report out the results to the CSA committee.
- H. The survey was carried out during Fall Registration, using MYUH and the committee awaits the results of that survey as of this date.

The Committee also offered a resolution to the Faculty Senate regarding the make-up of the Search Committee for the Hiring of the Chancellor. The committee felt that there needed to be sufficient representation on the committee of faculty who teach undergraduate courses and that all academic disciplines be represented. The Faculty Senate heard this Resolution at its December 7th meeting and it passed the Senate and will be passed on to the Chancellor Search Committee.

In March, CSA was asked to review the Possibility of a Course Subject Code for Student Affairs Initiated Courses. The issue arose after a letter was received by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs from the Vice Chancellor for Students, requesting such a designation. The VCAA passed the letter on to the SEC of the Faculty Senate who passed it on to the OSA Faculty Senate.

The OSA Faculty Senate responded in support of the request and the designation, and the SEC assigned the issue to three committees: CAPP, as lead, and CSA and CPM for review of E5:221 re: specialist faculty who “do not themselves teach or conduct research.” In addition, CSA addressed the larger issue of why such a designation might be necessary or desirable.

The CSA Chair called a special meeting of the committee on Monday, April 19th to discuss this proposal and invited Dr. Jan Javinar to give historical and philosophical background on the issue. The fact-finding for this issue resulted in the need for the entire committee to meet again before making our recommendation. We also need to convey our position to the CAPP and CPM committees but we will have to wait until the Fall to complete our work on the designation.

Conclusion: Although the Committee was not tasked with many issues this academic year, everyone on the committee took seriously our charges, attended the meetings regularly, and gave insightful deliberation on each of the topics. The recommendation is to continue the SD

Course designation issue into the Fall semester and to collaborate with the other two committees to come to a good decision.

I would like to thank my colleagues on the committee for their commitment and dedication and to also thank Kristin for all of her outstanding work on our behalf.

Respectfully submitted,

**Patricia Lee Masters, Ph.D.
Chair**