

Campus Fee Advisory Committee (CFAC)

Meeting Minutes

December 5th, 2025, 11am, Tula Community Center

ATTENDEES

Chair: Katie Olivo, Chair

Members:

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Kareen Holstrom | Stephen Schellenberg |
| Milan Rawls | Temple Northup |
| Abby McLachlan | Congcong Zheng |
| Aliza Siddiqui | Alana Ritchison |
| Nadia Gallarzo | Mary Anne Kremicki |
| Julia Biesman | Rashmi Praba |
| Marco Laza | Crystal Little |
| Andrea Acuna | Antonio Deninno |
| Joselyn Velez | |

1. CALL TO ORDER: Katie Olivo, CFAC Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:01am
2. Public Comment (Time Certain 11:00-11:30)
 - a. 13 students spoke in support of the fee. Their comments included the following themes:
 - i. Supporting athletics increases school pride, applications, national reputation, and the name recognition of an SDSU degree
 - ii. Passing a version of this fee with an allocation to Adapted Athletics will support underserved athletes
 - iii. Student athletes recognize the need for more services and repairs to athletic facilities
 - b. 10 students spoke against the fee. Their comments included the following themes:
 - i. The financial burden of this fee does not provide enough benefit to students, many of whom are low income
 - ii. Athletics should not be a priority for funding as many buildings on campus need repairs

- iii. Passing this fee should be put to a student vote
 - iv. Campus lacks mental health services and basic needs for students
 - c. 4 students from Imperial Valley (IV) campus spoke in support of the fee. Their comments included the following themes:
 - i. All students stated they support the fee only if the funds generated remain within the IV campus and community
 - ii. IV campus lacks necessities and needs support for upgrades to facilities
 - d. 1 student from IV campus spoke against the fee. Their comment included the following theme:
 - i. The additional financial cost would not be worth it to the majority of IV students
 - e. Public comment ended at 11:30.
 - i. AS Student Member and Chair – requested audience to remain silent as the committee moves into deliberations.
- 3. PROPOSALS: None
- 4. ACTIONS ITEMS:
 - a. Chair reviewed CFAC’s revision to the fee, developed based on student feedback through the alternative consultation process:
 - i. 3% allocated to financial aid
 - ii. Revenue from Imperial Valley students is collected locally for use on that campus
 - iii. Additional allocation to sports clubs
 - iv. Additional resources allocated to Adapted Athletics
 - v. Create an agreement outlining use of shared facilities between Intercollegiate Athletics and other campus users
 - vi. Phase in the fee over two years- it will increase by \$65/semester in 2026/27 and then increase to \$130/semester in 2027/28
 - b. Kareen Holstrom reminded the committee the importance of adding a return to aid portion of the fee in response to student’s affordability concerns. Additionally, per student comments, Adapted Athletics must be included, Club Sports needs an additional allocation, and IV portion must remain with the IV campus. Member wants to ensure that the allocation is fair for student body.
 - c. Abby McLachlan added additional context for the committee to put this fee into the economic condition it exists in. Member explained that at minimum wage for students,

this fee would result in approximately a month of work. Member does not want to push additional financial hardship overwhelmingly onto students. Member wants to reduce the fee or reject the fee. Supports previous member's recommendation about what the fee must include.

- d. Rashmi Praba reminded the committee that campus does have many resources to help students currently. Member recommended that a working group be created to better connect students that have needs with the many resources available to students.
- e. Mary Anne Kremicki explained that fees are necessary to backfill financial support. This fee would also be used to fund facilities improvements in shared facilities. Additionally, strong athletics program will continue to attract high quality students.
- f. Antonio Deninno explains that this fee broadly supports the ongoing operational needs of SDSU. The IT division is keenly aware of the needs for support that isn't "flashy". This fee, from IT's perspective, is critical to maintaining the university through facilities maintenance. Facilities maintenance will decrease downtime of building and facilities for students.
- g. Andrea Acuna said IV does not have many of the facilities that SDSU main campus has. Member and IV is 100% against the fee, unless the revenue from IV campus remains on IV campus. IV does not have the sports facilities that main campus has. This fee is not accommodating for IV campus unless the funds remain on campus. Member wants the fee to be used to toward facilities on campus that support intramurals or general health and wellnes.
- h. Kareen Holstrom believes that budget transparency as a whole must be included. Member believes fee must have a written agreement to explain shared usage of facilities. When CSU faces budget cuts, CFAC must try to balance student demands with growing campus demands. Member wants budget transparency to be a part of previously mentioned working group, and administration to be more active within the CSU to advocate for more funding. Per student feedback, member wants to reevaluate the fee process on campus such as alternative consultation. Athletics must be transparent with funding and develop sustainable revenue. Member open to discussion about incremental fee approach to this fee, to lessen the financial burden per student feedback.

- i. Milan Rawls supported previous statement. Member also stressed the importance of the memorandum of understanding to have a clear process for shared use. Member support that fee process must be reevaluated and that CFAC should annually review the alternative consultation process. The current alternative consultation process can not continue as it is.
- j. Kareen Holstrom recommends a new fee amount of \$120 with incremental implementation.
 - i. Year 1- \$60/semester
 - ii. Year 2- \$60/semester
 - iii. Year 3- \$90/semester
 - iv. Year 4- \$120/semester
- k. Stephen Schellenberg asked, if IV fee would remain with IV campus, who would decide how the fee is allocated in IV campus. Student feedback expresses many facilities IV wants but member believes that the requests exceed the available funding.
- l. Crystal Little explains that fee allocation in the past has been determined by students and leadership. For this fee, a similar process would take place; however, they do need to consider there are limitations on the spending of IRA fees per governance codes. When it comes to budget transparency, as a state agency, the budget is extremely complex, and use of funds is restricted by ed code. Member explains that transparency is important and would welcome additional conversation to improve transparency. Additionally, that this fee is a last resort as athletics have explored other methods of funding. The athletics budget has had a lot of budget evaluations. The benefits of the athletics program are important to SDSU and the greater San Diego area, there is a lot of value in this fee. Member feels strongly that the financial aid component of this fee will help students with the financial burden. The benefit of this fee creates a stronger SDSU.
- m. Temple Northup explained that they work with students who experience financial insecurity. Member asked, as the fee is vague, how much is going to each area? What would the MOU say?
- n. Crystal Little proposed implementing a budget proposal to get more specific details.
- o. Stephen Schellenberg expressed that allocating higher percentages to other aspects would come at the cost of other areas. Member does not feel comfortable with the lack

of information about the fee. Member recommends better information on where reallocated amounts are coming from.

- p. Kareen Holstrom stated that moving forward now might not be in good faith. Recommended mapping out the uses and specifics of the fee, including how much would be allocated to each area with a fee amount of \$120 over four years. Member also mention a possible additional allocation to the academic programs or identity resource centers already included in the fee.
 - i. Mary Anne Kremicki explained that student resources have already been growing within AA. Expressed that AA is not seeking additional resources. The student programs that were funded by the IRA allocation have largely been funded by the Academic Related Programming portion of the Student Success Fee.
 - ii. Rashmi Praba explained that there is already an IRA fee for identity resource centers. Identifying ways to be efficient with the budget we already have would be best. Expressed that increasing budgets could be excessive as some resource centres struggle to fully expend their existing budgets.
- q. Abby McLachlan asked what IV could do with the revenue from the IRA fee, per ed code.
 - i. Chair explained that the ed code includes athletics, forensics, student media, etc. and it could support a wide range of activities within those areas. Looking at the potential resources available to IV, they may want to lease space to expand intramural offerings.
- r. Aliza Siddiqui explained that there are students struggling and that it would be difficult to support this fee. Member expressed that international students especially are struggling with cost of attendance. Member does not feel comfortable with voting in support now.
- s. Congcong Zheng support's previous member. Requested to hear CFAC options as further deliberation is required.
- t. Chair explained that there is an additional meeting scheduled for next week to allow CFAC additional time for deliberation and an opportunity to review additional information. Chair explained that they would need to better understand what information the committee needs to make a decision.
- u. Kareen Holstrom asked for % of breakdown and allocation of the fee in a sheet form.

- v. Temple Northup explained that the money feels pretend when discussed in terms of percentages and wants to know the actual dollar amounts. For example, how much revenue would be generated by the fee from IV and would it then be able to build a facility for IV. Member wants to see a revised version of the original plan from Athletics to better explain the uses and allocation of the fees.
 - w. Andrea Acuna explained that money generated from fee could be used to help build facilities for IV or better support the campus.
 - x. Congcong Zheng summarized that the aggregate amount and % spread out over 4 years and more details on the agreement with shares facilities would be needed to make a decision.
 - y. Aliza Siddiqui wanted to discuss allocating a % of the fee to basic needs, per student feedback. Adding basic needs would help the member better support the fee.
 - i. Kareen Holstrom voiced support of one-time allocation from the campus for basic needs. Expressed that there is an urgency to help students with basic needs now.
 - z. Abby McLachlan explained that adding other aspects to the fee might spread the fee too thin for athletics, but it is still an increase to funding for athletics.
 - aa. Stephen Schellenberg made a motion to develop a shared spreadsheet to include %, estimates, projections with dollar amount, and with details on MOU. Expressed that there are good ideas but there is not enough information cohesion. There was consensus among the committee members.
 - bb. Marco Laza expressed that Athletics should be included when making a spread sheet so they can include their priorities.
 - cc. Chair explained that there will be a meeting next week to present additional fee information and to hold the vote. More information will follow.
5. INFORMATION ITEMS: None
6. NEW BUSINESS: None.
7. Reminder: None.
8. ADJOURNMENT: With no objections, OLIVO adjourned the meeting at 12:21pm
- Meeting Minutes prepared by Jordan Ardaiz and reviewed by Katie Olivo.