



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	11-12-12
Title:	Proposal to Change the Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) Operating Procedure
Presenter:	Josh Hiscock, Chair, Senate Student Affairs Committee
Date of SEC Review:	February 22, 2013
Date of Senate Review:	March 6, 2013
Voting (highlight one):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or <li style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	<p>In 2008, the President of the University of Maryland (UM) created the Committee for the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) as an advisory body on proposed fees and the use of student fees. The purpose of the body was to allow students to have an appropriate role in the fee process and to facilitate information-sharing with the broader University Community.</p> <p>In October 2011, the University Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Student Affairs Committee (SAC) with reviewing a proposal regarding the transparency and accountability of the fee process and advising on whether the operating procedure of the CRSF is appropriate. The 2011-2012 Student Affairs Committee reviewed the proposal, met with key administrators and the proposers, researched peer institutions, and reviewed the UM and University System of Maryland (USM) policies related to student fees. The committee presented three recommendations to the SEC for consideration in March 2012. The University Senate voted on April 19, 2012 to return the report to the committee for further consideration.</p>
Relevant Policy # & URL:	UMCP Policy on the Review & Approval of Student Fees (no policy number or URL listed).
Recommendation:	<p>The Student Affairs Committee voted in favor of the following four recommendations related to the procedures of the CRSF and the student fee process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All fee proposals must be vetted by a representative group of constituents and should include a description of that advisory

	<p>group. Student employees of fee proposing units should be clearly designated in the description, if applicable. Student employees of the unit should not be the sole student advisors to the unit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All fee proposals should include the enhancement request from the previous year, what enhancement the unit was granted in the previous year, and a description of how that fee was put to use. - The CRSF should maintain the most recent five years of enhancement narrative reports from each unit as an archive. The compilation of this archive should begin with fiscal year 2015 requests. These reports should be made available to the CRSF as needed. - Unit advisory boards should be consulted regarding fees and enhancements at least one meeting prior to the vote by the unit advisory board on proposed fees and enhancements. The calendar for fee requests as established by the CRSF should allow ample time for all units to deliberate.
<p>Committee Work:</p>	<p>The SAC reviewed the charge and the previous work done by the committee at its meeting on September 17, 2012. The committee also discussed new developments including a November 2011 memo from the UM Vice President and Budget Director containing guidance to fee-proposing units, and the newly-revised USM policy related to student fees.</p> <p>In October 2012, the SAC met with the Vice President and Budget Director to discuss the CRSF and changes in the fee process since the original proposal was submitted. The committee learned how changes are being implemented in the current fee review cycle. It also discussed what aspects of the policy and procedures remain uncertain because they are not fully implemented.</p> <p>The SAC analyzed the information and considered recommendations in December 2012 and February 2013. Key concerns related to unbiased representations of student interests, how enhancements are used, records of past proposals, and the calendar constraints of the student fee process.</p>
<p>Alternatives:</p>	<p>The Senate could reject the proposed recommendations and the current procedures of the CRSF and the student fee review process would remain in place.</p>
<p>Risks:</p>	<p>There are no risks.</p>
<p>Financial Implications:</p>	<p>There are no financial implications.</p>
<p>Further Approvals Required:</p>	<p>Senate approval, Presidential approval.</p>

Senate Student Affairs Committee

Senate Document # 11-12-12

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

February 2013

BACKGROUND

The Committee for the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) was established in 2008 to advise the President of the University of Maryland (UM) on proposed student fees and the use of student fees. As stated in the Policy on the Review and Approval of Student Fees (Appendix #2), then-President Mote created the CRSF to allow students to have an appropriate role in the fee process and to facilitate information-sharing related to student fees with the broader University community.

In October 2011, the University Senate received a proposal to review the operating procedures of the CRSF. The proposal raised concerns about the transparency and accountability of the fee process, and about the structure and operation of the CRSF. The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) voted to charge the Student Affairs Committee (SAC) with reviewing the proposal and advising on whether the current operating procedure of the CRSF is appropriate.

In the 2011-2012 academic year, the Student Affairs Committee reviewed the proposal and made recommendations to the University Senate regarding the operating procedures of the CRSF. During its review, the SAC met with the Vice President for Administration and Finance, the Assistant Vice President and Budget Director, and the Provost to gain an understanding of the committee's structure, the origins of the committee, and its role in the student fees process as an advisory body to the President. It met with the proposers, researched peer institutions, reviewed the UM and University System of Maryland (USM) policies related to student fees, and learned about how various units gain student involvement in their fee processes.

The SAC presented three recommendations to the SEC for consideration in March 2012, and the report, recommendations, and a minority report from a few committee members were placed on the agenda for the April 19, 2012 Senate meeting (Appendix #1). In considering the SAC's report and the minority report, the Senate voted to return the report to the committee for further consideration.

CURRENT PRACTICE

The Committee on the Review of Student Fees is responsible for advising the President and the Cabinet on recommendations for proposed fees, according to the UM policy (Appendix #2). The committee is composed of thirteen individuals: four undergraduate students, two graduate students, two faculty or staff members, one Senator (who is a faculty member), the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the chair of the committee, who is the Vice President for Administration and Finance. The policy stipulates that the review of fees will include five steps. First, units proposing fees provides an opportunity for a discussion of the proposal with the students affected by it. The unit then proposes the fee to the CRSF; the committee reviews it and makes a

recommendation to the Cabinet. The Cabinet then reviews the CRSF's recommendation and the proposal and makes its recommendation to the President. The President is responsible for recommending a fee schedule to the Board of Regents, which must approve of the fees before they may go into effect.

In current practice, the CRSF meets twice a year to address student fees. The CRSF reviews proposals for mandatory fees, fees that students are required to pay, in October and reviews proposals for non-mandatory fees, fees that students choose to pay based on whether they wish to use the services (room, board, and parking are examples), in the spring semester. The calendar is determined by deadlines at the University System level – the USM staff must have enough time to review and process all fee schedules for each USM institution before presenting the tuition and fees schedule to the Board of Regents for a vote, so it has deadlines for fee schedules that UM must meet.

Recent administrative and policy changes have altered the current practice of the CRSF and the fee process at UM. In November 2011, the Vice President and Budget Director issued a memo to all fee-proposing units with additional guidance on changes to the procedures of the CRSF (Appendix #4). Three new procedures were outlined. First, units need to provide a complete and accurate fee proposal to the committee regardless of the amount of the fee proposal, including those units whose fee requests are not changing. Second, units proposing fees must provide opportunities for students to be consulted on the impacts of the fees to ensure that student stakeholders are being engaged. Third, regardless of the amount of the fee proposal, all proposers must attend committee meetings to present proposals and answer questions about the use of fees, necessity of fee changes, and portion of the program supported by fees.

In July 2012, the Board of Regents voted to amend the USM Policy on Student Tuition, Fees, and Charges (VIII-2.50) (Appendix #3) to address the question of student engagement in the fee review process. It revised the policy to require that each institution ensure that advisory committees representative of students and stakeholders be established and that they be consulted during the fee review process on new student fees or changes for both mandatory and non-mandatory fees. The policy requires that the fee schedule submitted to the Board of Regents include a description of the advisory committee process and the names of those students and stakeholders involved in the advisory committees. The UM CRSF and the Division of Administration and Finance are working to implement this policy change during the current fee review cycle.

COMMITTEE WORK

The Student Affairs Committee began reviewing the charge and the work done by the previous committee at its meeting on September 17, 2012. The committee reviewed the charge, went over the work done by the committee in the previous academic year, and considered the report of the 2011-2012 SAC to gain an understanding of the issue and its history. The committee also discussed the new developments in the student fee review process – it reviewed the memo from the Vice President and Budget Director from November 2011 (Appendix #4) and the newly-revised USM policy related to student fees (Appendix #3).

At its meeting on October 8, 2012, the SAC discussed remaining concerns with the CRSF operating procedures and met with the Vice President and Budget Director to discuss the CRSF and changes in the process since the administrative and policy changes in November and July. The committee learned a great deal from this conversation. Key points from the discussion that influenced the committee's decision process included:

- In fall of 2012, students were not on campus long before fee submissions needed to be turned in, and many units were just beginning to set up student advisory boards in response to CRSF's instructions after the change in the Board of Regents policy. Some units had processes established already and were far along in gaining student input in the fee process, and other units had varying

levels of completion in terms of setting up advisory boards. The CRSF has made it clear that it expects the intent, spirit, and letter of the policy to be implemented.

- The administrative guidance in November 2011 and the change in the USM policy are not fundamentally different, and both intended to achieve student input in the fee process.
- The calendar of the student fee review process at UM is dictated by the calendar at the Board of Regents level. The many mandatory fees are considered in the fall and turned in then, so that System staff can process the mandatory fees for each of the thirteen system campuses in the fall and after the holidays. The few non-mandatory fees are considered early in February and sent to the USM in the spring so the System staff can pull all the components together for the Board of Regents to vote on the full tuition and fees schedule. The calendar may need adjustment in order to allow for significant involvement at the unit-level.
- The Vice President and Budget Director indicated that the appropriate place for the specific substantive concerns regarding the fees themselves and how they are spent can be addressed more effectively at the unit-level. The CRSF has limited time and a broad agenda, and the USM policy advocates student involvement in the determination of the fee, which indicates at the unit-level.

After its meeting on October 8, 2012, the committee worked to analyze the information gained in the meeting and compare what it learned to the concerns the committee had wanted to consider. In between meetings via email and at its meetings on December 10, 2012 and February 11, 2013, the SAC considered recommendations related to the CRSF and the student fee review process.

The committee discussed the nature and intent of student involvement in the unit-level review process. A few committee members discussed the balance between encouraging student involvement and ensuring an unbiased representation of student voices in that involvement. The committee discussed whether student workers of the unit would be considered biased and the unique aspects student workers bring to the conversation. The committee determined that student employees were critical to the student fee review process, but that they should not be the sole student advisors during the process.

The committee discussed different ways in which the CRSF procedures could ensure that fee proposals could include information about how enhancements were used. Committee members agreed that students should be able to know what was proposed and ultimately allocated, and whether the allocated fee did what it was intended to do. After much discussion, the committee came to the consensus that the information related to the enhancement request and allocation from the previous year was the most critical when considering a fee proposal. In the interest of preserving an institutional memory for the members of the CRSF to refer to when needed, the committee also discussed the creation of a rolling archive of enhancement narrative reports (i.e., the fee proposals) from each unit for five years. In the scenario discussed by the committee, the CRSF would keep the fee proposals from each unit on file for five years after they were proposed, beginning with proposals for fiscal year 2015.

In considering the work of the student advisory boards, committee members remained concerned that the boards would not have an appropriate amount of time to consider fee proposals before they needed to vote to send them forward to the CRSF. Committee members stressed that the student advisory boards should be given ample time to consider the proposals carefully, especially since the unit-level is where students can have a great deal of influence in the review process. In considering related recommendations, the committee attempted to balance the need for deliberative time with the recognition of the strains on the calendar of the student fee review process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

At its meetings on December 10, 2012 and February 11, 2013, the Student Affairs Committee voted in favor of the following four recommendations related to the procedures of the CRSF and the student fee process.

1. All fee proposals must be vetted by a representative group of constituents and should include a description of that advisory group. Student employees of fee proposing units should be clearly designated in the description, if applicable. Student employees of the unit should not be the sole student advisors to the unit.
2. All fee proposals should include the enhancement request from the previous year, what enhancement the unit was granted in the previous year, and a description of how that fee was put to use.
3. The CRSF should maintain the most recent five years of enhancement narrative reports from each unit as an archive. The compilation of this archive should begin with fiscal year 2015 requests. These reports should be made available to the CRSF as needed.
4. Unit advisory boards should be consulted regarding fees and enhancements at least one meeting prior to the vote by the unit advisory board on proposed fees and enhancements. The calendar for fee requests as established by the CRSF should allow ample time for all units to deliberate.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – 2011-2012 Student Affairs Committee Report on the Proposal to Change the Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) Operating Procedure.

Appendix 2 – UMCP Policy on the Review & Approval of Student Fees

Appendix 3 – University System of Maryland Policy on Student Tuition, Fees, and Charges (revised June 22, 2012)

Appendix 4 – November 2011 Memo to Fee-Proposing Units

Appendix 5 – Senate Executive Committee Charge on Proposal to Change the Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) Operating Procedure

APPENDIX 1 - 2011-2012 STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT ON PROPOSAL TO CHANGE THE CRSF OPERATING PROCEDURE



**University Senate
TRANSMITTAL FORM**

Senate Document #:	11-12-12
Title:	Proposal to Change the Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) Operating Procedure
Presenter:	Rachel Cooper, Chair, Senate Student Affairs Committee
Date of SEC Review:	April 5, 2012
Date of Senate Review:	April 19, 2012
Voting (highlight one):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	<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>
Relevant Policy # & URL:	UMCP Policy on the Review & Approval of Student Fees (no policy number or URL listed)
Recommendation:	<p>The Senate Student Affairs Committee approved the following recommendations to the operating procedures of the CRSF.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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

	<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>
Committee Work:	<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 & 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>
Alternatives:	The Senate could reject the proposed changes and the current procedures would remain.
Risks:	If the Senate does not approve the proposed changes, the University could miss an opportunity to increase student involvement in the fee review process.
Financial Implications:	There are no financial implications associated with the proposed changes.
Further Approvals Required:	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

APPENDIX 2 - UMCP POLICY ON THE REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF STUDENT FEES

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

**APPENDIX 3 - USM POLICY ON STUDENT TUITION, FEES,
AND CHARGES (REVISED JUNE 22, 2012)**

260.0 VIII-2.50 - POLICY ON STUDENT TUITION, FEES, AND CHARGES

(Approved by the Board of Regents, June 21, 1990; revised June 22, 2012)

I. Tuition and Mandatory Fees

1. The Chancellor, following consultation with the Presidents, shall propose guidelines for tuition and mandatory fees to the Finance Committee for recommendation to the Board of Regents.
2. As part of the formulation of the annual operating budget request, each President shall recommend tuition and fees within the guidelines established by the Board.
3. Tuition and mandatory fees shall be specifically identified in the proposed consolidated operating budget presented by the Chancellor to the Finance Committee. After the Board approves the consolidated operating budget request, tuition and mandatory fees may be altered only by agreement of the Board.
4. Tuition and mandatory fees approved by the Board shall be included in the detailed annual operating budget request for the University of Maryland System submitted by the Chancellor to the Governor and the Commission on Higher Education.
5. Mandatory fees include fees and charges applicable to a specific category of student according to enrollment status during the standard academic year. They include fees and charges for Health Services, Graduate Programs, and Auxiliary Services such as Athletics, Shuttle Bus, Student Union and Recreational, Student Activities, Supporting Facilities, and Auxiliary Facilities.
 - i. In the interest of giving the Board as much information as possible to make the best and most transparent decision regarding student fee schedules, each campus will ensure that an advisory committee--or other appropriate committee(s) involved in the processes of setting student fees is established--and is comprised of appropriate numbers of students and stakeholders representing each area supported by a student fee.
 - The advisory or similar committee(s) will be consulted in the establishment or change of student fees during the determination process.
 - The process by which these advisory committees are involved in the determination of student fees as well as the names of the students and stakeholders who make up the advisory committee will be submitted to the Board of Regents along with the proposed fee schedule.

II. Room and Board Charges.

1. Each President shall submit proposed annual room and board charges to the Chancellor according to a timetable and instructions recommended by the Chancellor and established by the Board.
2. The Chancellor, following consultation with the Presidents, shall present the proposed charges to the Finance Committee for recommendation to the Board.
3. Room charges include room, dormitory, and apartment charges for all university residence hall facilities based on a standard academic year rate.
4. Board charges include charges based on a standard academic year rate.

III. Other fees and charges.

1. Each President may establish fees and charges not included in sections I and II, subject to the provisions in the following paragraphs.
2. The Chancellor may submit to the Finance Committee for recommendation to the Board fees and charges that may significantly affect student costs, that may be considered for consistency among the institutions, or that may substantially differ among the institutions.
3. Student advisory committee(s) participation as described in I.5.i. for mandatory fees will be required for non-mandatory fee establishment also.

Replacement for: BOR V - 9.00; BOR V - 14.00; BOT XII - C.



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 - SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CHARGE ON
THE PROPOSAL TO CHANGE CRSF OPERATING PROCEDURE**



**University Senate
CHARGE**

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

Name:	Anna Bedford, GSG President, Ex-officio senator Kaiyi Xie, SGA President, Ex-officio senator
Date:	
Title of Proposal:	Proposal to change CRSF (Committee on the Review of Student Fees) operating procedure
Phone Number:	
Email Address:	
Campus Address:	
Unit/Department/College:	ARHU, ENGR/CMNS
Constituency (faculty, staff, undergraduate, graduate):	Graduate & Undergraduate
Description of issue/concern/policy in question:	<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>
Description of action/changes you would like to see implemented and why:	<p><i>Transparency</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - Detailed meeting minutes ought be made available to all members of the University community. Currently, only vote tallies are kept

	<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"> - 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. - 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. - The committee should have clearly stated guidelines in which its authority and purview is clarified, and then made available to the campus community. - The committee should have the power to elect its own chair in order to make the process more fair and equitable
<p>Suggestions for how your proposal could be put into practice:</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>Additional Information:</p>	

Please send your completed form and any supporting documents to 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