# Student Fee Review Board

# Meeting Minutes

April 6, 2015

1. Call to order

Lance LiPuma called to order the regular meeting of the SFRB at 5:05PM on April 6, 2015 at the LSC 304/306.

1. Roll Call

Lance LiPuma conducted a roll call.

Lance: Is there any gallery input? [There is none]. We will now move into presentations.

1. Presentations

* UTFAB
  + Presenter: Dr. Pat Burns [UTFAB Advisor]; Taylor Farley [UTFAB Chair]
  + Pat: Our current projected budget, of twenty-five (25) dollars per semester per student, has come out from one where we haven’t finished allocations or presentations yet. Revenue is 1.7 million dollars, and we had carry-forward of this fiscal year which resulted in 1.8 million. The mandated reserve is projected at 1.78 million. We have spent/allocated within two (2) percent of the total.

We are getting great feedback on the Echo project. Experimenting with new display carts in BSB 105, which is the flipped classroom we are using as a sandbox. [Look on the PP for other major projects.] Most of the money goes towards the student information system and wireless network projects. Most core information is the student system. We have more to say about wireless. That is the primary driver of the increase last year, we just weren’t keeping up with the infrastructure. We have it under control, if you don’t have a Mac; we are fixing the wireless across campus now. We have also simplified the wireless access and guests can long onto the network without getting credentials beforehand. We have good numbers: usually, are about 17,000 concurrent devices connected on the wireless network. A lot of the things that happen in the student information system are things you don’t see. Some you can see: The Ram Mobile app. This one is improved and allows you to authenticate and get services behind it. Some you should see: DARS had to be upgraded to U.Achieve. There is a new planner called U.direct, which plans out the whole graduation of eight (8) semesters. It helps advisors look at it and make sure there isn’t a waste of credits happening. Plus is helps us plan to have adequate capacity for the classes in the future. We also have Beacon, which has been huge. We also have the EAB advisor portal and we are creating academic alerts. Ninety-seven (97) percent of you, as students, have opted in to receive these, similar to the waitlist. We are in the three (3) year upgrade process for the current, battered student info system. We collect statistics on most of the projects, particularly the big ones. We are still seeing peak usage and growth in that. Onward to Lecture Capture. It is a combination of audio and the PowerPoint with the lecture. We can record video but that is usually only done by online plus. We have thirty (30) rooms that have been funded by you and OnlinePlus. Every year, this is the third year we have deployed these, we see dramatically increased use and downloads, which means it has been very successful I think.

Mandatory Cost Increase: This is going to take into account a lot of things: Student Information System critical retention plus salaries/benefits/other expenses; we have a contract with Ellution, and that has a five (5) percent inflation rate, fifty (50) percent funded by institution and fifty (50) percent done by UTFAB. There is a wireless FTW, and the Office 365 increase cost. And so there is about forty-nine thousand (49,000) dollar amount of the Mandatory Cost Increase for FY16. Allocations for next year are reviewed, and our best estimate right now is about 1.64 million. There are two ways of keeping up with these increases. Traditionally we wait five (5) years and raise the cost by five (5); so we asked ourselves, why not follow that up in a linear fashion year by year instead of jump it? If we do the jump method, we get behind. This can be seen in wifi. It’s dangerous as well because it might not get approved. The proposal for next year is no fee increase. We are able to do that because wifi’s cost for next year got sufficient funding from the university so it is going to absorb some of the needed UTFAB increase. There are some carry-over funds. Everything we know now: there will be about 111,000 of discretionary funds available in FY16. The FY15 Ending Fund Balance is 29,000 dollars plus the 40,000 dollar Reserve, and FY16 expenses shown are only those proposal that are already legitimized. So there should be about 100,000 dollars available next year for supplemental proposals in the standard process defined in the bylaws.

Thank you. If we didn’t have this funding we wouldn’t have the student info system that works today. This allows us to keep up centrally.

* + Questions:

1. Andrew: So I know that you had talked that we need a seventy-one (71) cent increase to keep up in the linear model. I know this year you had cost savings and some projections, and this will be a conversation for the board next year, but will there be a desire to continue with the quantum jump or do you want linear?   
   *Pat: I’m an advisor, only.   
   Taylor: Yeah, so that’s the conversation we are having. I think that the general consensus is to do the steady state. The seventy-one (71) cents is taking on the Office 360 needs, and that won’t necessarily be a constant increase. The Mandatory Increase next year might be fifty (50) cents. The board is comfortable having the 111,000 dollars in the Residual for the supplemental, and we would like to continue to have that to allocate around campus. So if it requires us coming back with that fifty (50) cent increase, the board is comfortable with that.*
2. Andrew: Are you going to add that 100,000 dollars to your bylaws?   
   *Taylor: No not officially, instead it’s just saying we have these supplemental proposals, and we want to keep having around that or even a little less. Having more in that budget is good for supplemental and it’s nice, but it isn’t anything official. We mainly want it because we won’t have to turn down anything we find really needed. It’s a good cushion.   
   Pat: The fact that UTFAB offers the fifty-fifty split for supplemental funds has been very beneficial. A lot of the improvements for the colleges wouldn’t have happened without UTFAB.*
3. Nick: So I’m curious. In the Student Information System, did you mention that there might be partnership with Semester at Sea? Inform my curiosity on that?   
   *Pat: Yes, definitely. So when the Provost offered the idea, we were one of the three institutions that wanted to give a home to Semester at Sea. It would give us good publicity and would give students more chances to do Semester at Sea. We are the ones that are negotiating with the finalists right now. We would integrate them into our Banner Student Information System. There will be a lot of heavy lifting to have to do that, but you talk to the Provost and it is a huge goal of theirs. This is something we will see not next year but maybe the year after.*
4. Andre: How did you come up with the seventy-one (71) cents, since it’s a little bit less than five (5) dollars for five (5) years?  
   *Pat: Yeah so numbers are approximate, we have raised it something like ten (10) bucks in eleven (11) years; so it’s not exact. Every year the students will vote on if they are going to do incremental and what that number for the increase will be. It won’t be prescriptive based on any numbers you see on these slides.*
5. Andre: What is the situation with Echo360?   
   *Well, they are exhibiting what I call big corporate behavior by wanting to raise our prices by fifty (50) percent over the next three (3) years. We are a Unison institution, and their head approached me asked if he could get in and I said no, and so we are negotiating. We didn’t want to pay for a Canvas-like system that they were trying to push on us. We are looking at other alternatives for lecture/video/computer. Pretty sure next year I can squeeze them to have constant cost for one (1) year, after that probably not, but it gives us a year to form an exit strategy.*
6. Duane: What kind of use are you seeing in display card use in flipped classrooms?   
   *Pat: TILT is doing a formal analysis of the flipped classrooms, including those as part of technology. Going wireless for projection systems has allowed us to experiment. We are getting rave reviews on the room in the BSB, but it is still too early to tell. I think we should have done six (6) small rooms instead of three (3) large rooms. We did everything wirelessly, which is a sandbox for us in terms of new technology for classrooms. I’ve heard nothing but rave reviews but TILT will have a greater answer on that.*

* CSU Athletics
  + Presenter: Steve Cottingham [Athletics Department Chief Financial Officer].
  + Sorry for being late. I was told to try and talk for about ten (10) minutes, but feel free to interrupt as we go along and we will have Q/A at end too.

The value derived from Student Fees is huge. The total fees are about 5.5 million, and the single biggest benefit from that is the All-Sports Pass. Students get free admission. We set aside 10,000 tickets for football and 2,500 tickets for Moby events. Other universities don’t necessarily do this; some places make students pay for tickets. We hope that you and your compatriots attend our games. All 10,000 student tickets at Hughes this year for the two (2) games were sold out. We want to make it as easy as possible for students to attend. You have heard from Dr. Frank about CSU 20/20 and us trying to attract more out of state students, not losing sight that we are the school for in-state people. One way to attract students is “top of mind” awareness, and athletics is one way to do that. There is a big category of kids out there that will hear about a place because of athletics. It helps bring people here and helps increase the value of your degree. It may seem irrational, but it helps you get in the door and network because sports becomes a topic of conversation. It’s also a huge resource for donor support. Sixty (60) percent of athletic donors move over and become CSU donors; so athletics is a great gateway to engage the broader university community and get someone back on campus. There is an excitement and drive there that helps engage alums.

The budget: 7.7 million is student financial aid as a trade with the university. For us financial aid is a cost: we pay tuition, room, and board as a Division One school for athletes. Salaries and benefits is out biggest expense. We are driven by compensation. We currently have a small debt service payment from some work in Moby years ago. Operations includes things like team travel, surgery, and everything else we do besides financial aid and compensation. We also have camps and trade. We might get free pizza from Dominos and that helps cover some expenses we would otherwise have. Department expenses break it down by functional area. So we spend about 2.9 million on administrative staff; salaries/marketing/ticketing/media are all revenue-producing so that’s 2.2 million. Athletic development includes fundraising, but mainly salaries; summer aids (student athletes need a certain amount of completion towards their degree so they can bridge the scheduling conflicts they have); Fifth year aid is for those who need the extra year to graduate; and sports performance includes sports medicine, strength and conditioning. The eleven (11) million is overhead functional stuff that needs to happen, but the bulk of budget is spent on sports. We spend a lot of our revenue on sports. The other sports that we don’t directly sell tickets to still have some philanthropy, about 5.2 million. All of this comes to about thirty-four (34) million a year.

We need you to show up to our games, because that’s one of our biggest challenges. Today we are coming with the request that we have a $2.24/semester (2.08%) mandatory only. This is needed to cover salary/benefits and inflation in other operating costs. We don’t feel it’s appropriate for them to go to financial aid, so since we are a people business we calculated the fee is based on the university compensation increase. We take the percent increase and provide that to the student increase, not to the overall salary increase which would be bigger than that.

* + Questions:

1. Rioux: Have you all figured out how much the cost of all the tickets would be, based on the numbers you give away?   
   *Average ticket price is thirty (30) dollars, times 10,000, times six (6) games, so that’s a large amount for just football. And it’s similar for others.*
2. Kelsey: What were you accounting for in other expenses? –*That’s all the ends. The template you normally ask us to fill out isn’t normally what we use, and so it’s really everything that wasn’t captured by the above categories.*

Kelsey: Do you know the exact things you put in that category?  
*The other operational things that we do. Everything other than travel, compensation, financial aid. 8.3 million of the 9 million or so in operations. Uniforms, equipment, medical expenses, etc.*

1. Brandon: Could you touch on the summer fee and why it’s not sixty-five (65) percent of the Fall/Spring fee? Why is it so much smaller?  
   *I think it’s because there aren’t events going on. There really aren’t summer events, so it didn’t seem as fair to charge the full.*
2. Luke: Will you elaborate on the gradual decrease in fund balance over past few years?   
   *About three (3) years ago, the decision was made to spend down reserve. Wanted to grow the department. Two (2) choices: don’t do it and continue with poor results, we weren’t very good and students were mostly graduating but treading water; or we can get bigger and better. Three (3) years ago there was a staff rollover and a decision made to infuse resources into the department. We wanted to draw more on Top of Mind attraction. So to do that we spent down the reserve. We wanted to drive down athletic reserve instead of having to tap into additional university resources. I know that’s different than other areas who are expected to maintain the reserve, but I think CSU aspires to be a Division One athletic program. Even though we are an auxiliary enterprise, we aren’t going anywhere. We are also looking into progress in having the department generate its own resources to go forward. Our ticket revenue for football was up about seven (7) thousand, for example.*
3. Andrew: Two Qs: So in regards to the summer fee, how many of staff are working?   
   *All of us.*   
     
   So the only thing that changes is no events?   
   *Correct. Well—I mean, volleyball starts before school starts, but essentially, yeah.*  
   Ok so then I have a follow-up: To cover the potential shortfall of a lapse or decrease in enrollment, 1) do they have an intent to rebuild the reserve and 2) If they don’t, is it expected that they will tap into reserve at the center if there is lapse/decrease in enrollment?   
   *I think if there was a lapse in enrollment—I don’t foresee in the near term that we would rebuild the reserve. We would have to look at what we could do to scale back the expenses. We are being paid to play some football games, which is new. Those weren’t games we used to schedule, so there are things we can do to make up things here and there. Philanthropy and ticket sales are also major. If it was a big increase, then that would be difficult, candidly, like half a million. If it was fifty thousand (50,000), we could probably find other ways.*
4. Andre: My question is piggybacking off of that. Spending down the reserve fund balance: you said it went back into the program to try and improve the image. What specific monetary changes occurred in that time period?   
   *I mentioned the football all-time high ticket revenue, and we are also up about 900,000 in our conferences. The new college football playoff format has helped us this year and we get additional revenue because of that. Football guarantees as well. We are looking at things for 2016.*

Andre: I guess I am asking more about where the money you spent down from the fund balance went?   
*Into the pot, honestly. We don’t be specific, it goes into the overall budget for each team/department. Most increases go to teams though. That’s what drives the success.*

1. Andrew: I realize everyone is staying away from these questions, but I need to ask. I know there is a commitment for stadium to not impact student fees: how does cost of developing and maintaining the stadium impact the athletic fee as a whole?  
   *So the financial model for new stadium does not involve student fees. Period. Or tuition or anything. The university has borrowed 225 million dollars, and the forty (40) year repayment schedule comes out of expected increased revenue generated by the stadium. This means higher priced tickets, selling more tickets, selling naming rights, etc.*

So if there will be an increased number of seats available, will we see increase in student tickets available or will it be paid ones?   
*Overall, seating is pretty comparable in initial design, and long-term the whole thing will expand. Right now the plan is to stay at 10,000 seats for students.*   
  
You also said you are looking at increase of cost for seats for alumni/community. Will that happen to the student tickets as well?   
*Nope, your costs will still be zero.*   
  
Will there be the opportunity for different sporting events or campus events to occur at the stadium?   
*Yes. The stadium is intended to help all of campus. Tony Frank has mentioned lacrosse being in there. There will be—well, we are still talking through plans for university events, like an all-university commencement. I fully expect we will continue to make it available to campus as well.*

1. Andre: As far as classroom space in new stadium: how much will there be and will it be geared towards only towards Health and Exercise Science?   
   *I’m probably not the person to speak to that. There are still conversations going on. Originally—in the not-too distant past, it was 85,000 square feet of space. That decision was tabled. But it will be prepped to have that space built out. Also, further conversations are being held about being more efficient in classroom use and what departments would be there. It’s probably more a question of timing and university needs.*
2. Dinner— Potato Bar!
3. Presentations Continued

* Walt Jones: UCA
  + Thanks for asking us to come. We want to start with some good news, and that’s that we have run it by several members to have all UCA performances be free to students (for theatre, music and dance). We did that, and… Cheryl?

Cheryl: It’s $1.16 per semester, per student to make all the events free to students. We hope you are excited about it!

* + Andrew: So uh I got the opportunity to talk to Brandon about this, we beat it around with a number of people. How would you handle the number of student tickets available for an event? If you make it free for all students, would that ratio of fifty-fifty change?

*Walt: If anything it will make the public buy tickets earlier. The students can also reserve tickets like anybody else, then we would reconsider if a lot of people [students] made the reservations and didn’t show up.*

*Cheryl: We also factored in an additional staff member for the UCA, to make sure the tickets are actually being given to students. I honestly thought it would be a lot more than $1.16.*

* + Walt: Another question was one of diversity. Diversity is a moving target, I gotta say. The music program does do symphonies and operas from composers all over the world; dance does pieces that are more representative of the actual dancers than the choreographer. Religious diversity was also mentioned, and there is an undergraduate program track that address that. Theatre is a different story. We no longer have “color blind casting” like we did in the 1980s, where you would cast anyone from any ethnicity in those plays. You can’t cast a white guy playing a character named Jose, but you can cast an individual named Jose as a character named Scott. There are a couple kind of ethnic playwrights: those who write specifically for the culture that they are, and they respect/demand actors who are in the same community. While we have been really interested in plays that have diverse playwrights, it can be hard. Next year though we are doing two plays that have non-white playwrights, and in the past we have done Chicano-American writers. Again, those playwrights who will allow us and don’t presume the cast will be made of Latino Americans. The programming is as diverse as CSU is, and how diverse the people in our program would allow us to be. Theatre is one of the highest in diversity, but not all of those folks are in performance. And we need a critical mass of actors of color in order to do the plays that are more stunning and diverse in their contexts.

Also. We did not get the position we are asking you for from central, so Production/Materials is not an issue. But I want to point out that SFRB has been supporting the Production/Materials fee ever since there has been a fee.

You all wanted more details on the position and what the person would do. I had Roger come in to talk about that.

Roger: I’ve only been here two (2) years and what I realized is that we desperately needed a production manager. Theatre has a lot of different departments, and we needed somebody to oversee all of those areas and keep everyone communicating, on schedule, and under budget. We took someone out of the shop and put her in that position to do this—so now we have one less skilled professional in the shop. We want to hire a recent graduate with some professional experience, and we want to lure them here with more experience and because Fort Collins is cool.

Walt: The skill set we will be looking for is more in the carpentry end, probably, but once again the person who is applying for this bridge position (between academics and professional world) brings unique things to it.

Roger: I’m hoping for someone for the CNC (Computer Guided Cutter), a program that can cut out sheets of wood for you. Those are the kinds of skills our students can master, and then they are marketable. We just got a new 3D printer that the tech fee paid for, but the CNC coming in is a huge opportunity because no one else is learning it yet.

* + Questions

1. Kelsey: So concerning music, I’ve actually seen that most of the music is Christian-based. Are you planning on doing other songs?   
   *Walt: Well, most music is based in religion. Looking back in history, most of the major composers and songs that were popular had roots in the church.*
2. Lyn: Actually, Walt, I just looked and it seems like the position was given to you. It’s here on the sheet.

*Walt: Oh, wow, really? Well thank you for letting us know that.*

1. Lance: Will you please come back with a New Resource Request that takes that position into account?   
   *Walt: Definitely*
2. Old business

* IVSRF – NRR
  + Ryan: I move to adopt the IVSRF New Resource Request. [Seconded].

Lance: We are now entering discussion and debate.

Ryan: Does everyone remember what this was asking for? I’ll explain again, just in case. So basically it’s no longer looking at the salary, and basically asking for increases in Materials and Supplies for the Reframe campaign.

Rioux: So I thought the NRR was paying for the front desk hourly?

Ryan: It’s still going to paying for it, just using funds from salary savings.

Lance: So it is a twenty-seven (27) cent increase now. Plus it is the fifteen (15) cent decrease from last meeting, so it would be a total of twelve (12) cents.

Lance: So for FY15 Projected was $4.13, last year’s we reduced it to $3.98, so now we add that.

Ryan: It should be $4.25.

Rioux: I think this falls under the salary savings from this, it’s building off the $4.13 from before. So savings was twenty (20)-some cents, which is about… it’s an increase up to $4.40.

Ryan: I’m worried because we approved it to be $3.98, I wonder if the $4.40 is accurate and it should be $4.25 instead. So I would like to confirm that it is $4.40 and not $4.25. Because if we approved the fifteen (15) cent Mandatory it doesn’t make sense.

Rioux: If you look back to the older request, it was fifteen (15) cents more than the twenty-seven (27) cent increase, or it was forty-seven (47) cents which is twenty (20) cents more, but to me it looks like it adds up.

Ryan: So we are comfortable with the $4.40? If no one else is concerned then I see no problem.

Lance: So with the New Resource Request given to us, for the twenty-seven (27) cent increase, which does not include the new student staffing to run the WGAC?

Ryan: No it does, it’s just including salary savings. They’re seeking the student fee increase to cover Reframe.

Lance: Ok because the original New Resource Request with the forty (40) cent increase contained more in it. So is this twenty-seven (27) cents specifically just for the leftover needs after the salary savings?

Ryan: Yes. The salary savings is about 40,000 dollars, I believe.

Lance: The twenty-seven (27) cent increase would just be for Materials/Supplies and nothing for salaries/benefits? I don’t; feel comfortable moving forward this, it should be $4.25 and not $4.40. Right now this is showing it to be $4.40, which would be the vote, but currently if we don’t have the mandatory the New Resource Request would be $3.98. So right now if we vote on the $4.40, we would be increasing it by forty-two (42) cents, which is double what they are asking. We can pass the vote on the twenty-seven (27) cent increase even though the proposed is $4.40, it will be $4.25.

Brandon: So if it is $4.40, do we have to re-vote next week?

Lance: We will just say it is a twenty-seven (27) cent increase.

Rioux: It’s not asking for an increase over the mandatory, it’s an increase over last year. They are separate requests.

Lyn: That is correct.

Lance: Please bring us back the budget sheets.

* UCA- Mandatory
  + Brandon: I move to approve the UCA Mandatory. [Seconded]. Walt helped satisfy a lot of my concerns with the fee, and while we will be going back and looking through different potential New Resource Request, the Mandatory is straightforward and we should vote on it tonight.

Lance: Is there any more discussion and debate? [There is none]. Moving into a vote. [Takes roll call vote]. That passes.

* CSU Health Network
  + Nick: I move to vote on the fee for both the Counseling Center Mandatory and Hartshorn Health Center Mandatory. [Seconded] I think both of these were presented well and with a lot of details, and they do good things for students on this campus by fundamentally caring for us. They deserve the mandatory fee increases.

Lance: So that would be $2.22 for the CSU Counseling Health Center Fee. We will now move into a vote for the CSU Counseling Health Center Fee. [Takes Roll Call Vote]. We are now entering the vote for the CSU Health Network Hartshorn Fee, which is an $11.50 increase. [Takes Roll Call Vote]. Both of those pass.

* RamRide
  + Sam: I move to adopt the Ram Ride Fee.

Lance: We do not have the audits back yet, so we cannot do that.

* LSC- Mandatory
  + Sam: I move to enter Discussion and Debate for the LSC Mandatory fee increase. [Seconded].

Rioux: Point of Information. Is this for Ram Events?

Lance: Ram Events is under the LSC, there isn’t another form for it.

Rioux: But they are proposed as separate fees.

Lance: But they requested no fee increase, and it’s within the LSC. The sheet is there to demonstrate how much of the fees go to Ram Events.

Nancy: The LSC mandatory does not include the $9.21 Ram Events.

Lance: It doesn’t? Ok. So this is not including Ram Events. We are now on the LSC only, then, which is looking for a $3.26 increase. Now entering discussion and debate. [There is no discussion and debate]. We will now enter back into old business.

* + Sam: I move to adopt the LSC Mandatory Fee Increase. [Seconded].

Lance: We will now enter into a vote. [Takes roll call vote]. It’s unanimously passed.

* Ram Events
  + Sam: I move to add Ram Events to the agenda. [Seconded] There is no increase so why not add it?

Lance: Adding anything to the agenda requires a two-thirds (2/3) vote. Please raise your hands if you would like to add Ram Events to the agenda. That passes.

* Ram Events: Mandatory
  + Sam: I move to vote on Ram Events Mandatory Fee Increase. [Seconded].
  + Andrew: Considering there is a zero (0) cent increase, obviously it will get passed. I would like to inform the board that there is a number of conversations with Lance W. of handling concerns about event selection process and the limited number of student involved in that conversation. ASCSU has been trying to make more student involvement and utilization happening. I see no reason to not pass it, so that they can be assured they will operate next year and we can continue to have these conversations.

Nick: Echoing previous speaker, I see no reason not to approve the zero (0) cent increase. But I think having these conversations in terms of spending the money and for those on campus should be a conversation we continue, but I also think that we should work with the rest of ASCSU and that it shouldn’t be the sole responsibility of the board to move this along.

Rioux: Looking through what they have done so far this year, I’m not sure if the zero (0) cents is mandatory for them for what they have been giving. They could spend less money. I yield to gallery.

Will Maher [In gallery]: I echo previous speaker. They need to have a budget passed, but I do not think there is an appropriate allocation of this budget. We should decrease it or allocate the funding in a more appropriate and responsible way for student government.

Andrew: I would like to remind the board that we cannot line item or request that a decrease, that doesn’t happen on the board. Due to bylaws, they don’t need to send us a decreased budget request. So I urge us to pass it in favor of continued conversation to make sure the fee is utilized effectively. Holding it as a ransom sends the wrong message. We want to have that conversation with ASCSU as well about how Ram Events is being done. I urge a yes vote.

Rioux: Have any of these conversations started with Ram Events yet? Because if we pass it, I don’t see much leverage in discussion in trying to approve that oversight immediately. I want to know where we are.

Lance: Last Friday, Will Maher in the gallery and I had a great discussion with Lance W, and what we can do. I yield to the gallery.

Will: We had a conversation in the smaller grievances we aired last week, and we examined those further. Lance W. agreed we needed to work on these. So while these conversations are happening, there is power in emphasizing those continued efforts. Over the last five (5) years it’s been a “we will work on it” situation. It needs to be more than a conversation— we need power behind it. If not, we run into the situation we’ve had before.

Andrew: So having been here for three (3) years, holding the budgets is completely disrespectful. These questions and comments should have come up in the Fall. We should have communicated we were not happy with them last Fall. Lance W is one hundred percent committed to having the student fee being utilized as effectively as possible, and he is also directly supervised by Mike Ellis, and he’s great at fee utilization. What we can do to erase concerns on all sides is to attach a fiscal note saying passing will be contingent upon continued conversations about the utilization of this fee. Holding up the fee and everything they will do as ransom is unfair and deteriorates the relationship with the director as a whole. The long-term relationship is more important than the momentary bargaining chip.

Rioux: I would like to have that we add as a fiscal note. I motion to make a fiscal note: for next year’s passage we would like to see additional oversight, including checks and balances, with the student government or similar organizations. [Second]

Will: one thing I would ask is that one of the things we discussed is the possibility of doing an all-student homecoming events schedule. We want that in there. It is lacking in this university and is at every other university. It’s for alumni and students.

Charlie: You, Rioux, asked if any of us had discussions with Lance W. about it. And when I asked him if they had done any polls or had any info, he said they had some information and that he would get it to us. But the email I got today just had polling done on people who had already participated in the events. So I think that polarizes the discussion by only having groups that have done it. I agree with previous speaker that you can’t just hold it hostage. If we could ask for specific ways to hold them accountable, I’m asking if we can do that, or ask for them to do something like a poll for all of CSU.

Rioux: I rescind my motion and plan to bring it back next week.

* + Lance: Now moving back into discussion and for Ram Events.

Rioux: I object to the question. [Seconded].

Lance: All in favor of returning to the agenda and not voting on this tonight, give a show of hands. By a vote of 19-1, that passes.

* Evan: I move that we close Old Business, skip New Business, and move into announcements. [Seconded]. We are low on time and Lance has some announcements. [There is no Discussion and Debate]. [Unanimous Aye Vote occurs].

1. New Business
2. Announcements

* Brandon: If you have input on the UCA, particularly in fees to bring back for increase, please talk to me.
* Rioux: Since we have a week, I want to spend some time putting together the fiscal note, so please email/talk to me.
* Laffey: Would a question to the previous speaker be ok?

Lance: Only if it’s beneficial to the board.

Sam: Yes.

Lance: Go ahead.

Sam: So how is it a fiscal note if there aren’t any numbers attached?

Lance: This is not germane. We will settle this outside the board.

1. Adjournment

Lance LiPuma adjourned the meeting at 7:26PM.

Minutes submitted by: Michelle Sogge

Minutes approved by: [Name]