# SFRB

# Meeting Minutes

February 23, 2015

1. Call to order

Lance LiPuma called to order the regular meeting of the Student Fee Review Board at 5:06PM on February 23, 2015 at the LSC.

1. Roll call

Lance LiPuma conducted a roll call.

Lance: Is there any gallery input? Seeing none, so I will turn it over to Craig.

1. Presentations

* Conflict Resolution

1. Craig: Good evening everyone. Thank you for the opportunity for our staff to share the budget and services. My name is Craig Chesson (Director/Assistant Dean of Students). Also present are: Melissa Emmerson (Associate Director of Conflict Resolution); David D’Alessandro (Coordinator of Conflict Resolution); Sam Sickbert (Graduate Assistant); and Brooke Whitman (Assistant Director of Conflict Resolution).   
     
   Our main goal is to promote civility on campus. The focus of today is conflicts at the lowest level, and we help foster a community on campus. We will talk about Restorative Justice later but we help students on and off campus. We also engage in character development in our workshops.

Melissa: We want to highlight our services. Our main focus in conflict consultation/coaching, which is for neutral third-party opinions. It gives the users who we help strategies to resolve conflict. Mediation/Facilitation would be for small-scale conflicts. We also do various trainings throughout the year; we’re participating in the REAL certificate program to help with that. We present to grad students about conflict, and throughout the year. We’ve already done 49 presentations and had about 2000 students involved since this fiscal year.   
  
Also, we offer the Restorative Justice program, which is when a student has caused harm to others and together we pull all of those parties together to create an agreement. Student-police interactions gone bad can often use this. We also have impact panels; our most popular is the neighborhood impact panel. This is often for students who receive a noise ticket with egregious noise/impact, or with many repeat offenses. These panels are facilitated by our staff when long-term residents come in and share how they have been impacted by noise/disruptions. We also do this for games. It gives the perspective of the other members. It’s pretty powerful to hear it from the stakeholders.   
  
We also have education workshops that students are referred to via Student Conflict. We usually see Freshmen in those workshops in the basic levels. We have the Party Partners workshops, facilitated with the Fort Collins police, that provide guides and information to students. A third of our case load is grade appeals; number two is roommate disputes; and number three is student/faculty disputes. We also will meet with panicked students about what will happen when they have been accused of a misconduct. It is confidential in that setting, so they have the chance to express worries and concerns in a safe manner. Student organizations, in previous years, have come through in large numbers. We aren’t seeing that as much this year. The advisor conflicts are often involving PhD students, and I am currently working on a case that has been going on since 2012—I say this to show that it can take a while.   
  
We survey all students at the completion of a case; 95% of students think that Student Conflict Resolution is a valuable service, and 94% feel better equipped to handle a conflict after coming through.

1. Craig: With the student fees, none of our funds support the conflict side of the house. We have student workers with clerical/daily duties, and also having a student intern—those are the things covered by the fees.

Melissa: I want to give you a snapshot of last Fiscal Year compared to this Fiscal Year July to January. Our cases and contacts are going up and up and up, and they still are. We just got Brooke on board, and having David on board has really really helped since September. Our educational workshops have risen from twenty-three (23) to twenty-seven (27), with quite a few more students. Those numbers are definitely telling.

Sam: Our numbers continue to rise. I have a cost comparison of the workshops with our prices compared to other places. All the workshops up here are free, whereas at CU Boulder or in the city students have to pay. That’s something we strive for and are proud of.

1. Melissa: Here are the highlights from this Fiscal Year. I was freed up by the new hires this year to talk with policy-makers about the grade appeal policy, which isn’t too friendly to students. Many legitimate cases can’t be accepted because of the requirements. The policy-makers are in agreement and have been working with me to do an update on the grade appeal policy. We also decided to start a Restorative Conversation Series, in October. We invited Wendy Cohen as a guest speaker, who presents with the brother of the murderer who killed her daughter. That was a pretty powerful one, and will add more as the years go on.   
     
   We also want a Restorative Justice Diversion Program. Let’s say a student is charged with criminal mischief. If they are sent into our program then their charges may be dismissed completely. This is a benefit because we don’t want students graduating with criminal records, and because sometimes students get the opportunity to say that they are sorry.

Brooke: A big reason why David and I were hired was to expand current programing and create new initiatives. One is the Downtown Impact Panel, which grew out of our Neighborhood Impact Panel. It is a discussion between students and the community members to give the students a bigger picture. 100% of our student participants in Fiscal Year 2014 agreed with the statement that they now have a greater awareness of their impact and that it will positively influence their decision-making choices. So it used to be a neighborhood panel, but now we also have a downtown community panel, too. They get asked questions and get to hear the perspectives of others, with the hope that it will lead to a greater since of community and what it means to be responsible.   
  
We also have the Community Violations Class, and the city is offering a Municipal Violation Class. So this is an opportunity for people to learn the laws and repercussions, and to gain insight on how to avoid similar offences. The problem is that this is only available for students who are written into municipal/county court. So we wanted to do something similar to this program that fit the values of the Conflict Resolution Service program, and it has been really successful. We plan to offer the first class sometime in April.   
  
Lastly is our new article in the Collegian: we have an “Ask Conflict Resolution” monthly column in the Collegian. This is because there is shame around having a conflict, but it is a huge part of everyday life, so we want conflict to seem more approachable and normal. So we can educate, reach out, and let them know in a *Dear Abby* format about our services. *[Passes out a description of the two new services they offer and the latest article in the collegian].*

David: I’m going to quickly talk about marketing. We worked with CoLab and the students in CoLab in order to create this campaign, which uses memes. It has kicked off now; we wanted to wait until we had the full staff to implement it, and now we do. They are on-and off-campus. We are really just trying to push the Conflict Resolution side of the office, because it can be more than conduct. The memes are supposed to be funny so that people aren’t embarrassed about conflict resolution. Hopefully this will bring in more people, and I think they are really good. Memes are good because they can change over time. So we can just keep reinventing them.

1. Craig: Here is a budget template. This year, we ask for a twenty-seven (27) cent increase to cover mandatory expenses. Salary fringe, tuition increase, graduate stipend, and student hourly/fringe are included. This would make the fee go from seven dollars and sevent cents ($7.07) to seven dollars and thirty-four cents ($7.34). Everything else would stay the same, and right now we still have a nice and healthy reserve as well. So that is it.
2. Questions
3. Finance Statement Fund Balance:   
   Scott—From Fiscal Year 2015 Actual to Fiscal Year 2015 Projected there is a dollar increase. Why did that increase happen?  
   *Craig: It’s upstart for new staff—desks, computers, tables*. *Things like that. We knew we would need them.*
4. Brandon: How has adding the two (2) new staff members affected the office?  
   *Craig: How much time do I get? I could tell you, one of the things to bring more sanity to Melissa. There are two pieces. The first is our volume—we could not handle it with just one person. Which is good in terms of showing that we are doing our job, but we needed them [the new hires]. There was no honeymoon period for them because we were so busy. The other piece is the ideas and creativity. David’s new marketing, Brooke presenting; it’s been great. We couldn’t take things on before but now we can. It’s been a HUGE addition.*
5. Brandon: It took about six (6) months to get the second hire; what happened to that salary savings?  
   *Craig: We knew that the salary savings would help with expenses coming up, with things like workshops or incorporating i-clickers. Those are targeted expenses. And with travel and searches for jobs, it can cost a lot to do the job hiring process.*
6. Lance: Why increase in student hourly/fringe pay?  
   *Craig: Right now, it’s a staff where everyone works hard, so it’s to increase the salary for the staff. I think it’s an important message to send to hourlies, and to those who get to the intern position. To be above the mandatory means to further inspire and motivate the staff.*
7. Sam L.: What is the additional operating expenses increase for?  
   *Craig: We are required to contribute to Student Affairs marketing, so that is it.*
8. Lance: For Other Revenues, you’re generating $1500. Where is it coming from?  
   *Craig: Interest.*
9. Lance: Brooke, where are you from?   
   *Brooke:* *Minnesota*  
   Lance: Will you give us some background on your experience?  
   *Brooke: I have a BA in Psychology and also have a Masters degree; for the past five years I have been working as an educator in schools; I’m a trained mediator; I’ve done a lot of facilitating and conflict coaching in the past five years.*

Lance: And Dave, this is your first time at SFRB, correct? *David: Yes. I’m from Boston and came out here fifteen (15) years ago to attend CU. But I’m a Ram through and through now. My undergrad was Philosophy and my MA was Conflict Resolution. I worked for five (5) years at my Master’s location with facilitation/training for conflict management and in the courts doing conflict management for eviction/harassment orders.*

1. Lance: Anything else you would like to touch on?   
   *David: One of the things I’m planning on is a peer mediation group. As Craig mentioned, we got here and started having students. I’ve had four hundred (400) appointments since I’ve been here. I haven’t had that much time to create other things, but I’ve loved working with the students. Each grade appeal is different; it’s all fresh and new so right now I’m focusing primarily on the students.   
   Brooke: We’re also talking about creating a conflict resolution skill-building assessment workshop so they can gain increased effectiveness in understanding their own styles and managing conflict. Conflict is a part of life, so we’re working on creating a sanction. So when Conduct deals with a student who has been destructive multiple times, we could offer this workshop to help them get better skills. We also recently updated a lot of different sanctions that conduct can refer to (conflict coaching is an example). Also, just reaching out to more organizations on campus since we have more time. We just trained with ALVS, actually. We will be working with a sorority coming up. So that’s some projects in the upcoming future.*
2. Sam L.: Are you a Packers or Viking fan?  
   *Brooke: I’ve only watched one (1) football game in my entire life. I’m neutral.*
3. Andrew: This question is more Melissa. How many hours a week do you work now? Because I remember that last semester you were working a lot.  
   *Melissa: [Laughs]. The great thing about having the staff is that the turnaround is much better. So our service to students is super fast. I work less than I did. When requests come in on the weekend we can delegate those faster too. Again, now I can focus more of my energy on the big fish.*
4. Andrew: Following that up with a more serious question. A complaint last year from Conflict Resolution Services at the SFRB was that there was a very long turnaround. What is the wait time now? *Melissa: Students are getting in the week-of, no doubt. And as I said last year, getting them in wasn’t the problem. It was the follow-through. And the follow-through has been positive; we went from seven hundred (700) to nine hundred (900) appointments in the year, so the turnaround is improving significantly.*
5. Dinner Break- Pasta!
6. New business
7. Conflict Resolution Student Conflict Services

* Andrew: I move for approval for the mandatory SCRS budget increase. *[Seconded]*

Sam L: Point of information? In Student Conduct they mentioned they would look at student hourly pay as mandatory. Is that considered mandatory in student funding?  
  
Lance: I’ll direct that question to Lyn.   
  
Lyn: Is this an existing employee having a yearly salary increase?  
  
Lance: No, it’s a student hourly increase. So it’s based off of hours. They only discussed it briefly in the presentation.   
Mike: So if it’s due to minimum wage increase or the two percent (2%) increase for students, then yes. If it is adding additional hours, then no. It’s $12000 at four percent (4%), and most other fee areas are at about four percent (4%) in mandatory. So it doesn’t feel like there is much of an increase in there, but you could clarify it.  
  
Lance: I asked about the hourly and he said he wanted to keep it above the minimum, which wasn’t the minimum required increase.  
  
Nick (liaison): The student hourlies in question—the only students who aren’t in an internship are the front desk individuals, about two (2) at any given moment. So it seems like they are increasing the hourly wage and not the hours. I don’t think they are work/merit study. Even if it wasn’t mandatory, it is still a very minimum piece of the request, to about a cent or two.  
  
Rioux: The said hourly plus fringe benefits, so that’s all as one increase. This is mandatory, not adding more hours.  
  
Jason: To make it better for them as a student hourly, they had the internship; they wanted to make it more like the student internship to increase the drive of those applying.  
  
Mike: Even if it’s not mandatory, it’s only $11300 in a fee increase, whereas the other increase is $12000, so you could consider it not being in the mandatory.   
  
Pat: I’m under the impression that they need to clarify.   
  
Lance: We would ask the liaison to bring back hard numbers to breakdown the 27c.  
  
Andrew: I retract my motion.

* Andrew: Instead, I move to not vote on the mandatory tonight and instead have a fee area liaison bring us back an itemized breakdown specifically for student hourly salaries and benefits in the salary line, and also more of explanation of the $1547 in Other Revenues, to know if they are reoccurring or not. *[Seconded]*  
    
  Lance: To clarify, we would be discussing what to have the liaisons to seek in terms of more information. We would not be taking the vote on the mandatory tonight.

Nick: His mandatory proposal can have a breakdown, but would it necessarily change if we approved it or not, since he put it forward as his mandatory?  
  
Lance: Well it does have to follow regulations of what the mandatory is. So we could vote no if it didn’t follow that mandatory fee requirement.   
  
Mike: You are right.  
  
Lance: We wouldn’t vote, we would just make a statement that those aren’t mandatory fees. We would just withhold the vote, not vote yes or no. So if we vote no on the mandatory, then what we should discuss is whether to seek more information. *[There is no further discussion and debate].* All in favor of Andrew’s motion to not take the vote tonight and have the liaisons find more info? *[Takes vote.]* That passes sixteen to zero (16-0).

Lance: We will now enter discussion and debate on what to task the liaisons with.

Andrew: As I said before, we should have a fee area liaison bring us back an itemized breakdown specifically for student hourly salaries and benefits in the salary line. And also more of explanation of the $1547 in Other Revenues, to know if they are reoccurring or not. If it’s not, then it will be another one they are coming up with next year.   
  
Duane: Point of Information. That isn’t a cost, it’s a revenue.   
  
Andrew: But I’m curious if they will have that every year, because if not it will become deficit of this fee package that they are running. And where will it end up on the budget, because if it is an interest revenue then why haven’t we seen it in the previous years?   
  
Sam L.: I have a comment on what Andrew said. I feel that this sheet is probably not taking into account for the budgeting and just happens to have it there as last year’s revenue.   
  
Andrew: Ok. That concerns me.  
Brandon: I have a slightly different concern. Salary and fringe benefits for Fiscal Year 2015 in Actual versus Projected. Given the fact that one of their employees was only hired this past January, that six month period of no pay $2500 should not be in Fiscal Year 2015 Projected, but instead in something under Travel/Other operating expenses. And even then, I’m questioning how that would amount to $2500, and whether or not they could have used that to prevent needing a mandatory increase. That’s more than what they would need for the increase. Is Fiscal Year 2015 Projected accurate of what it is going to be, and if there is the savings then where is it going in the budget instead?

Lance: Point of information—Fiscal Year 2015 Projected/Approved are the exact same. That doesn’t occur.

Jason: I think he did do the job search, but also said it came out of fund balance. So $8000 deficit was more than the savings of the salary.  
  
Rioux: The $8000 doesn’t come from this year. Fiscal Year 2014 added total less than they projected, so that’s where the $8000 came from. It went from sixty-three thousand or so (63,000) to fifty-five thousand or so (55,000). Hence why it didn’t increase to $63,977 like they expected from FY14 to FY15.   
  
Jason: Why was that job search so much less than this new job search?  
  
Brandon: They had to do two searches.  
  
Nick: Basically, the position which David currently holds is at the coordinator level, and they did a smaller/faster search and filled the position quickly. For Assistant Director (Brooke’s position) they did the initial search, came back, weren’t comfortable with candidates, regrouped, did a broader search, and then searched more.

Lance: Any other Discussion or Debate for the liaison?

1. Old Business
2. New resources request for WGAC (IPVS)

* Andrew: I move to open discussion and debate on the IPVSF budget [*Seconded*]. So I reached out to students on campus, including some fee areas I’m representing, and I got an overwhelmingly positive response. Main question was for Ref**ram**e campaign, because the majority of the fee proposal is that campaign. I got the comment over and over that the “It’s On Us” campaign is being pushed forward but we still need to be doing something more with it, even though we meet the requirements.   
    
  Ryan (liaison for IPVS): I didn’t do any constituent input, but I got the questions that you all had answered. The first is why the budget for staffing the LSC WGAC office is coming out of the IPVSF instead of WGAC. To be honest, Kathy didn’t have a good answer. She was just asked to have a student space in the LSC and the 1-3 account didn’t have enough for the hourly people. If it didn’t come from student fees then staff couldn’t be hired and the front desk at the LSC couldn’t be fully utilized.   
    
  The second question was whether or not those salaries are merit work study. The answer is yes. At $8.45 an hour, with one-third being absorbed through work study. Peer educators would get ten (10) hours each week with a $1200 stipend. They go in assuming they will get work study, so if they don’t get it then they will be short.   
    
  Lastly, you asked to have any salary savings for Assistant Director directed into increasing their fund balance and absorbing mandatory fee increases. I brought up the suggestion we made and she said the salary savings can’t be used to absorb the mandatory fee because they are instead already going back into the student fee budget.  
     
  Rioux: I also talked to constituents. They thought the idea of adding staffers to WGAC was generally good, and most people were in favor of that.  
    
  Andrew: Point of Information for the rest of the group. WGAC was set up for their own individual funding unit under the university, and then they had the IPVS fee put into place by students in 2010. This was under Babos and Cooper. The idea was designed around improving awareness/safety for everyone. So we’re caught in a grey area right now where we have staffing fees coming out of WGAC. So we need to talk about whether or this is ok, to have staff support out of the office from the IPVS fee.   
    
  Lance: Also, I have some more information as well. Dissimilar to ALVS, WGAC is not completely paid for by student fees. So the state and student fees go to the WGAC under Tony Frank’s administration.  
    
  Duane: I spoke to some ALVS students, and there was some mixed concern about the co-mingling of these funds. But overall they seemed to support the initiatives coming out of the offices.   
    
  Lance: Is there any other discussion or debate? *[There is none]*. Seeing so little input, I encourage us to hold off on vote.  
    
  Andrew: I request that the leadership of SFRB searches back through the archives and finds the proposal for this fee area, to find the exact purpose of the fee area. If safety on campus is the original thought, then the staffing would fall under that. But I’m concerned that when it was proposed, it might have been different. I would like that within two weeks.

Lance: That will be done.

Andrew: Also, I move to table this. *[Seconded].*

Lance: Any discussion or debate? *[There is none.]* All in favor of tabling the IPVSF fund? *[Takes vote.]* That passes.

1. ALVS Fee Discussion

* Andrew: I also got feedback from constituents about the ALVS fee. They wondered why we didn’t have this yet and thought veterans needed to be supported on this campus. The consensus was that if this was something we could offer, then we have an obligation as Americans to do it more than anything. I yield.

Kelsey: I also received constituent input on ALVS from Warner College and they asked me why they asked for money for the new counselor, and to not just educate the old counselor. Nick, do you remember the details?  
  
Nick: Yeah. So, the concern came from an adult learner in the college who felt like the services described in this position were already being offered and he didn’t see the need as much currently going through that office. He wanted to see existing positions expanded.

Duane: As an Adult Leaner, you are treated differently in the Career Center. The first questions they ask is if you are a student. If you say yes, then they instantly ask “Currently?” There are also certain barriers between a standard nontraditional student and a veteran. We are seeking a translator for military skills to workforce skills. A lot of places can’t do that. What is being sought after is the liaison position that already exists in style, but we have different needs on the veteran aspect. It’s hard to translate skills learned in the military into a workforce need.  
  
Lance: Jason, will touch base with Jeremy since he is speaking soon for the Career Center, and ask him to elaborate on that for us?   
  
Jason: Already planning on that.  
  
Connor: I also wanted to say that they stated they didn’t want to limit helping veterans to the seven (7) categories.  
  
Duane: Sharon Lindell, who currently provides this service as the Veterans Employment Representative, is legally restricted as to what veterans she can serve. The service is limited to having it only help those who have a barrier to employment, and if you aren’t she legally cannot help you.  
  
Brandon: They are also planning to have this person be in a new program as well, and to expand some initiatives.  
  
Kelsey: I was telling him about the seven barriers, and he asked why she couldn’t expand?   
  
Duane: The answer to that is Colorado law. She’s a governmental worker with no association with CSU.   
  
Kelsey: So the new person will be a CSU employee?   
  
Duane: Yes.

1. Discussion of Tabling and Presentations

* Lance: I think week before Spring Break we should have a tabling event. That would make it the week of the 9th, two weeks for now. I’ll talk to make and get that set up, and will come back with benchmark and action plan. Another announcement: liaisons who have yet to present, touch base with your fee area director. We are reviewing what we have seen in the fall. We need to have more discussion on the actual funding and fees. We already know what they are doing in terms of services, so we want to know the actual monetary part of it. So let them know to plan for maybe a five (5) minute overview and a fifteen (15) minute overview on what the fee is going toward, and then ten (10) minutes of discussion and debate.  
    
  Andrew: But how many new people do we have?

Lance: 8.

Andrew: So do they know what is going on? Because for them the review might be helpful.

Lance: Yeah, we have planned for that and are meeting with them. So we will cover it with them individually.

1. Discussion of Athletics Fee Area

* Sam L : I need to know if there is something specifically you want to know about the athletic fee area. You should all think on it because I know it can get messy and contentious. Don’t say the questions now, just come prepared later to discuss it.

Mike: I need to say that they haven’t been contentious in past years, though, so don’t come in thinking that.   
  
Sam: I meant to say they are a larger fee area, and so we have paid more attention to them.

1. Discussion of Liaison Duties

* Mike: This spreadsheet should not have come in here tonight for Conflict Resolution. There are errors in this and you need to catch them. Lyn and I are here to guide you, and we can work on them together. But you need to be aware. In this case, the Projected is wrong, and even the Actual is wrong for Fiscal Year 2014. I know that because if you look at travel, it is $12,000 all the way across. How often would your travel funds be like that for *all* four years? The exception to that is money transfer to the ENG account provided by the university; then it can be a round number.   
  Nick: I didn’t see the sheet before tonight.  
    
  Rioux: I did. I hold responsibility for that, because I did not catch it.  
    
  Mike: And that’s not your fault, because it is their fee, but you need to be assertive in the fee budget, and ask questions and make sure that you see the fees.  
    
  Lance: Nick, have them bring back a different one.   
    
  Nick: We will.

1. Adjournment

Lance LiPuma adjourned the meeting at 6:45PM.

Minutes submitted by: Michelle Sogge

Minutes approved by: [Name]