

Special Course and Academic Program Fees Committee Recommendations Summary 2022

Fee Name	Committee Review Notes FY22	FY21 Amount Reviewed And future collections
Applied Music Course Fee	<p>The revenue collected in FY22 from this fee was \$2,140. The fee was not spent this fiscal year and 100% of the revenue was left remaining. The rationale provided for this oversight was that a new administrative assistant was hired and she was confused on how to process the invoice that was larger than the revenue collected. The committee was concerned since this was not addressed during any of the quarterly reviews prior to the fiscal year closing. Something could have been done to reallocate some of the charges from the piano tuning expense so that the fee could have been spent in its entirety. Given that 15% of the revenue from this fee was left unspent last year the committee was especially concerned. Despite the concerns the committee will not reduce the fee in FY24, but urges the budget manager that quarterly reviews are extremely important and must be conducted by the budget manager so that he/she can rectify errors before the annual review where it is decided whether or not the fee should continue to be charged to students.</p>	<p>\$30.00/Course No change in FY23 and FY24</p>
Film Production course Fee	<p>The revenue collected in FY22 from this fee was \$10,139 and \$8,086 was spent from this fee which left 20% of the revenue remaining, which is considered significant by the committee. In the past this fee was managed well. So while the remaining unspent revenue concerned the committee no recommendation of cutting the fee was made. The rationale provided for this oversight was that a new administrative assistant was hired and she made an error with charges that she was unable to rectify. The committee was concerned since this was not addressed during any of the quarterly reviews conducted by the budget manager prior to the fiscal year closing. Something could have been done to reallocate some of the charges that were supposed to be allocated to this fee. Despite the concerns the committee will not reduce the fee in FY24, but urges the budget manager that quarterly reviews are extremely important and must be conducted by the budget manager, and not by an administrative assistant, so that he/she can rectify errors before the annual review where it is decided whether or not the fee should continue to be charged to students.</p>	<p>\$32/course No change in FY23 and FY24</p>
Film Studies course Fee	<p>The revenue collected in FY22 from this fee was \$3,378 and \$5,400 was spent from this fee which left a 60% deficit, which is considered significant by the committee. It was explained that the department had to unexpectedly spend more for the film studies courses right before the close of the fiscal year due to unexpected changes in CELT providing access to films for the class. The manager stated that they were unable to</p>	<p>\$15/course No change in FY23 and FY24</p>

	<p>use their OS&E for this expense (but the reason for that was unclear from the narrative) so the charges were allocated to this budget which caused it to be overspent. The budget manager also explained that some charges were charged to this account by mistake early in the fiscal year. The committee would like to remind the budget manager that mistakes can be rectified during quarterly reviews and urges him/her to be more careful during quarterly reviews so that errors can be fixed prior to the end of the fiscal year. The committee does not recommend any changes to the fee, but is concerned about the additional cost to the film studies program with the changes made by CELT for the films. There may be a recommendation to increase the fee in the future.</p>	
<p>HFMG Lab Fee and HFMG Liability Fee</p>	<p>The revenue collected in Summer and Fall of FY22 from this fee was \$3,723 and \$2,341 was spent from this fee during the Fall which left a 37% remaining, which is considered significant by the committee. The review that was initially submitted did not adequately explain any issues that the fee manager experienced. After receiving a modified review during the appeal process the fee manager explained that the fee was not collected during the spring. Normally the fee manager provides the bursar's office with a list of the courses that charge the fee so that the fee can be collected. Given that there was turnover in the bursar's office it appears that the list was not processed. The fee manager's dean asked the fee manager to not spend from that account until the issue was resolved; therefore, the fee manager was not able to spend the remaining revenue that was collected during the previous semesters. This led to there being fee revenue remaining in the account. The SCAPFA committee has noted that revenue has remained in this fee account in the past and has concerns about the management of this fee. We would like to stress the importance of completing the quarterly reviews of both revenue and expenses. If done diligently, fee managers learn early when the fee is not being charged to the student's accounts and if the bursar is notified early then the problem can be rectified. It is difficult to collect fees that are not charged to students after their fee payment deadlines have passed. The committee recommends keeping the fee the same for FY24, but urges the fee manager to be much more careful.</p>	<p>\$35.00/Lab Course No Change in FY23 or 24</p> <p>\$21.75/course No Change in FY23 or 24</p>
<p>Nursing Program fee review and Application.</p>	<p>The revenue collected in FY22 from this fee was \$100,748.00 and \$97,661.80 was spent from this fee which left only 3% remaining. The committee feels that this fee is very well managed and spent responsibly to support students in the program. The committee recommends no changes to the fee and recommends approving the application to charge the same fee in FY24. This will require BOR approval per USG guidelines.</p>	<p>\$283/semester No change for FY 23; Recommend approving application for \$283/semester for FY24.</p>
<p>FNP Program fee</p>	<p>Since FY20, this fee is no longer collected from students due to the fact that there was an unusual amount of revenue that was not spent. This fee is different than most</p>	<p>\$0.00 since FY20, but fee rolls over; Application</p>

	<p>program and course fees in that it rolls over each fiscal year given the nature of the program and how the fee is collected. It was decided in FY20 that sufficient revenue existed in the budget to cover expenses of the program through FY2024. At the start of FY23 \$35,558 remained in this account which will certainly cover the expenses for FY23. As this revenue is spent the budget manager is required to submit a fee review. In FY22 the expenses allocated to this account appear reasonable and in line with the purpose of the fee.</p>	<p>for FY23 or FY24 was not recommended given the revenue remaining in the account.</p>
Biology Lab Fee	<p>The amount of revenue remaining was \$12,162, but \$13,373 of that remaining revenue is currently encumbered and will be spent. The budget manager overspent the account by 2.5%, which is reasonable, and did an excellent job managing the budget. The committee unanimously agreed that the fee should remain unchanged, but the budget manager needs to remember to use the latest form for his/her review (the old form was used). No appeal or modifications to the fee review are required.</p>	<p>\$35.00/lab course No change in FY23 and FY24</p>
Chemistry & Physics Lab Fee	<p>The fee revenue was overspent by roughly 10%, which is reasonable. The fee manager promises to be more careful in the future. The committee unanimously agreed that the fee should remain unchanged and requires no appeal.</p>	<p>\$35.00/course lab course No change in FY23 and FY24</p>