# Student Fee Review Board

# Meeting Minutes

March 9, 2015

1. Call to order

Lance LiPuma called to order the regular meeting of the SFRB at 5:05PM on March 9, 2015 at the LSC 304/306.

1. Roll call and Gallery Input

Lance LiPuma conducted a roll call.

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

1. Presentations
* SLiCE (Student Leadership, Involvement, and Community Engagement)
	+ Presenters: Pam Norris [Director], presenting with Patton [SFRB Liaison]. Nine (9) staff members are also present; they include Michele Frick [Accounting Tech], Kim Grubbs [ASCSU Administrative Assistant], and Hermen Diaz [Assistant Director, Involvement & Student Organizations].
	+ Pam: Thank you for your time and serving in this leadership position. We appreciate what you do. I’m turning this over to Patton to get things rolling. Our scrapbook is going around, plus the big bag of chocolate that y’all really need to finish.
	+ Patton: Hi. SLiCE stands for Student Leadership, Involvement, & Community Engagement here at CSU. We have three different areas: leadership, involvement, and community engagement. Our mission is to transform students and transform the world; we adhere to this mission by maximizing student potential through high quality, innovative services. One area of pride that we have is that a lot of our services are student initiated. They can also trace back to tradition: in the Fall Special Needs Swim will be going for forty (40) years, Cans around the Oval will be over twenty-five (25) years. This slide here shows our numbers of service: this means service hours, leadership hours, and the monetary value of the services students do. Quick fact about SLiCE: in 1975 SLiCE was created by your predecessors, so y’all created SLiCE that you see in front of you right now. The programs and services we give are because of you and predecessors. I also want to go a bit into my story. Because of the programs and services provided, I have been able to find my family here at CSU and my best friends and my mentors. They are there in good times and the bad, when I laugh and cry. Now to Pam.
	+ Pam: Here you see this wordle, which we have put some assessment data into on what people are thinking about SLiCE after they attended a program. We are coming off of a great fall: we got back into the LSC, and it’s wonderful to be back here and increases drop-in traffic significantly. Also all of our programs are full, and are often over-applied to. We are benefiting from a great and involved student body. What you will see is that every couple of years we spend some time in SLiCE doing strategic planning to retain relevancy. We hold traditional programs but they are hugely popular, so we want to hold onto those but also grow events. We have to ask ourselves the questions, “What matters most? Are we really transforming students? Are our programs HQ and innovative? And are we maximizing student potential?” At the same time we ask these questions, we are thinking about a staffing model that meets student needs and also holds onto the values, and we need a strategy to ensure we have a culture of involvement on campus. There are about thirty (30) students and nine (9) professional staff, who would agree that we have a very active student body. At the same time, a lot of student say, “Oh, if only I had known about the program when I was a Freshman I would have done that.” So students need to understand what is available to them and need to have a conversation about maximizing time outside of classroom while using skills gained in classroom.
	+ We have recently started six (6) new programs: these range from international experiences to projects that get us into our community, to workshops that are readiness workshops to ensure that students will be prepared to lead/manage in internships/jobs. We have praxis projects that have become really popular. An example is Patton coordinating TGIF—CSU students are partnered with high school students that have disabilities to create a normalizing social experience. We have discovered that there are probably about twelve thousand (12,000) students participating in SLiCE. This is two thousand five hundred (2,500) more than just a few years ago. Students are coming with expectations about involvement so we are creating programs to keep people thoughtfully engaged, but at same time over seven (7) years we haven’t changed the staffing model. We haven’t asked for New Resource fee increases and gotten one since 2006, but we are bursting at the seams in terms of interest. RamLink is also a service we have offered, which is a tool that allows people to organize involvement opportunities. We collaborate with UTFAB with that, and they are paying for it currently.
	+ Budget: We spend fifty-six (56) percent on professional staff, twenty-six (26) percent on programs and general expenses, and eighteen (18) percent on student staff. We have five (5) graduate students, and the rest are undergraduate, around thirty (30). Our programs are growing and the twenty-six (26) percent continues to grow, and we have been super creative about Work Study because we didn’t want to ask for a fee increase. The savings that we have for that is how we have supplemented that programming line. Over the past few years, many offices are employing this tactic on campus. So the number of our Work Study Awards have gone down a bit. So what you will see in front of you are two different budget templates: I would like you to look at Mandatory plus New Resource Request. I thought it would be helpful for line-for-line where we have notes. We are asking for a seven point zero eight (7.08) percent increase, which includes Mandatory and a new Program Coordinator in office. In Revenue, you will see self-generated includes Alternative Break payments, host involvement expos, and the partnership with UTFAB. Under costs: this includes the increase for mandatory in the new Program Coordinator; travel line is used for alternative break trips so I know it’s high but it’s not the professional staff going on elaborate trips (but we do professional development for our staff).

Under Operating Expenses: we have assistance-ships for the two (2) graduates so we pay for their tuition; we also have pilot programs that we have every year, and we spend between ninety-six (96) to ninety-nine (99) percent of our budget, but we roll over as much as we possibly can so even that one (1) percent would be used for the next year in a pilot program. So this year we are piloting a program called PACT. We will see if it is something that sticks or not. In terms of Fund Balance: it’s a little high. It should be at $180,000. Here is what is going on: we anticipated moving back into the building and buying furniture for our two spaces and the other stuff, and we haven’t got it all spent. We wanted to live here for a while to get feedback from staff and students, and we are planning to spend the seventy five thousand (75,000) spent by June 1st on the things needed for office. The $48,979 has been money that we accumulated over the years. As stated before, we don’t spend one hundred (100) percent of our budget, we try to spin it out on pilot programs. We have a long list of ideas for programs that we can start. Our hope is by next year we will be back at the $180,000 for the fund balance, and not have it up so high.

In terms of the new position we are thinking about: we want them to specifically be working with student organization areas, but working generally in SLiCE will be helpful. We will have over four hundred (400) student organizations at the end of the year. Over three hundred (300) choose to have financial accounts with us, so we are resourcing students like a bank and helping students navigate legal things and recruitment/retention, on top of event planning, obtaining grants, and seeking out assistance for ASCSU matters. Right now, our graduate student and a full-time staff member do the lion’s share of the work. So we have been able to serve the students fine, but not to the level of their/our expectation. We would love to be available on the turn of a dime, but it can take time. We want to hire a Program Coordinator to help manage and lead day-to-day operations of student orgs. That will free up time on Hermen’s schedule to create a culture of involvement on campus. Because the culture that’s real for you and your experiences here at CSU is that you have been involved in many things that may not have been through SLiCE. So we have to be out cultivating opportunities for students because we can’t facilitate all the events for the campus. We have involvement coaches/coaching that helps new students make choices/decisions and pockets of involvement, but if you don’t happen to fall on the sidewalk at the right time or are not the right major, you may never know about the opportunities. We want to change that.

* + Questions:
1. Rioux: I’m looking at Mandatory New Resources: the summer fee doesn’t seem to add up right. It’s nine (9) cents lower, and a ten (10) percent increase. Maybe this is an error? I wanted to make sure the wrong number wasn’t affecting the amount of projected revenue.
*Michelle: I will have to do some recalculations.*
2. Andrew: I wanted to dive a little more into the 48.9 thousand that you are using for pilots. How often do things stick from those programs?
*Pam: We have a hard time letting go. Probably praxis is a good idea of something consistently that is happening. Students come together and pitch the idea and often it has social consciousness around it, and in the example of TGIF it was really popular after about two years. We took TGIF on after the leader graduated, and we have great students involving themselves with this. It’s not servicing hundreds of thousands of students, but I would guess that the impact of that program could be greater than students just doing occasional hourly service. We balance high impact activities in the office and the importance of smaller things like CSUnity. I would say there are a lot of projects in the pilot programs that are high impact and seem to be sticking. And that’s part of the staffing challenge; we don’t know where to position the programs.*
3. Andrew: So is that part of the reason for the program coordinator? To corral newer programs and offset the burden a bit?
*Pam: Yes. Over the last seven (7) years, the number of student organizations has grown significantly, and while some always fade out we are by in large seeing a lot of consecutive involvement. Their numbers and popularity grow, and the events/activities they do on campus becomes a lot more than meeting on a random evening.*
4. Duane: On Other Operating Expenses, you list tuition increase for two (2) graduates, but on the chart I see three (3) graduates. I also saw one of the graduate charges is oddly outlined? Can you explain that?
*Pam: That outline is just the program, sorry about that. The third graduate is shared with the Student Center, so they pick that fee up for us.*
5. Brandon: On the same line, could you touch on why the New Resource proposal is roughly seven hundred (700) dollars more than the mandatory budget?
*Michelle: This is rounding. The template is really strange, it rounds when you put in different figures. I’ll get you the corrected sheet also once we fix the summer. There isn’t a specific reason.*
6. Kelsey: So I’ve been involved in SLiCE programs before, and the same people tend to be in the programs again and again. Would the program coordinator give a wider variety of people involved?
*Pam: In some ways it is a really good thing, because more exposure to things like Alternative Break or POP can lead to friendships. We do our vest best to attract and be open to all students. Some of that repeat has to do with comfort levels in terms of applying for positions: if you know people who are helping to encourage and coach you around interviewing, you are more likely to apply. There is an intimidation factor around the concept of leadership, and we try to diffuse that as much as we can, and a lot of that can happen through student organizations, and then you are building confidence about coming to the office and knowing it is available to everyone. I would also say that Patton is a great example of someone who has participated in a lot of programs, and we have cultivated him over time to grow. He is one out of thirty thousand (30,000) on campus and he is going to be a significant leader and server in the community he chooses to live in because of all that. So it’s a balance of how do we serve the masses, but inevitably have students that find their home and hunker down and build their home around that, and they will show up multiple times in programs. It’s a balance.*
* **Campus Recreation**
	+ Presenters: Judy Muenchow [Executive Director]; Jennifer Daniel [Business Manager]; Connor Barry [Liaison]; Cody Frye [Director]; Tyson Kehler [Associate Director of Facilities].
	+ Judy: This is the most recent packet we had to make a very small adjustment. So the cover memo and the template have a bit of a change from what Lance passed out to you last week. I wanted to explain for myself what’s in the packet but it takes all of these folks, and Connor is going to actually present most of the info because he really understands it. When you deliberate what we talk about tonight Connor is well-versed in these. We color-coded: Blue is the Repair and Replacement schedule, and Cody will speak briefly to this. The packet is our backup documentation. You can go through the top sheet for the Overall and the next sheet is our Revenues. The line number of the template shows what made up those figures. Next sheet is Expenses in salary for admin and state classified, and the next is Expenses for our student hourly, and the next page is Travel/Supplies/Services/Utilities. All are color-coded and coordinated and have the notes on the template. And I will reiterate that Connor is well-versed on all of them.
	+ Connor: So contrary to the agenda, we only want the Mandatory fee request. One other thing the Student Center handles is the sports club fee, and those will not increase. We have no increase for off-campus student recreation center users. We are only seeking increase for the student recreation center and covering mandatory costs. We are also looking into a four point nine five (4.95) percent Materials and Supplies increase. There is a conference that hasn’t happened for thirteen (13) years, and self-generated revenue will be paying for that so that’s where that increase goes in line thirty-seven (37). The thing that changed from the initial sheet is the Fund Balance in line forty-seven (47): it decreased three point eight nine (3.89) percent because we are spending it down with the contribution to facilities management for the student recreation center. One other expense is the thirty thousand (30,000) dollar decrease in one-time facilities management expenses.
	+ Jennifer: The only thing that changed in Fund Balance is that I had the wrong figure for what it was. For some reason I hadn’t changed it from the prior year. So that’s what made it look like an increase but it really was a decrease. We bought fitness equipment for the Rec Center.
	+ Judy: And Cody will speak to that. I realized we are the first Auxiliary (such as the LSC) to present. For those of you who are new, that means that we maintain our own facilities and utilities. So our budget will look very different to ones you have seen before.
	+ Cody: This is the “R and R” (Repair and Replacement) that I’m showing you. If we get a hole in the roof at the Rec Center, we can’t just call someone and get it done for free. We have to pay for it. I have a plan that goes out for a few years for replacing things like carpet and fitness equipment. You can see that in Fiscal Year 2014 we replaced all the cardio equipment in the Rec Center for five hundred thousand (500,000) dollars. This year we have spent about one hundred and fifty thousand (150,000) on new weight equipment, and in Fiscal Year 2018 it will show us replacing the cardio equipment again. We include about one hundred thousand (100,000) a year to put into a plant fund –like a savings account— and in Fiscal Year 2018 it shows we draw that out. So this is a plan for the things we know about and things we can anticipate being a problem or coming up in the future, because we want to keep the Rec Center the best we can.
	+ Judy: That is it, in a nutshell. We welcome any questions and clarifications, particularly if you are new.
	+ Questions:
1. Andrew: So I know you have two (2) bonds running through the Rec Center, what portion of the $5697 is going to the bond retiring in 2018, and what portion in 2038?
*Judy and Jennifer: I don’t have the figure now, I could send it to you. Prior to renovation it was about twenty-five (25) dollars, and I think now it is about fifty (50) dollars for the total fee. The original building was bonded first, then it rolled off, and the second bond was for the addition in 1998 and was about three (3) million. I don’t know if we could break that out. We can certainly try but it is really hard to find even the two (2), because it goes back so far and was before our time. Our bonds got rolled together, probably in 2001. [Ask Lyn for clarification, she does not know]. When we went for this third bond, we kept the amount for the third bond that was rolling off, and the figure we had was first and second together. We never knew what they were like separated. We even went to old records in the library to find SFRB stuff and we only found a memo that was sent out, and it also had the two (2) bonds together. But total, about fifty-six (56) to fifty-eight (58) dollars goes to the bond.*
2. Andrew: So I realized that you have at least another two (2) years until the 2018 bond rolls off; any thought of what you will do with that portion of the student fee?
*Judy: When we went through the business plan for new bond, they wanted three hundred fifty thousand (350,000) to four hundred thousand (400,000) put away, and right now we are only doing about one hundred thousand (100,000) to two hundred thousand (200,000) away. So I’m anticipating that the plan would be us being able to put aside the money for the “R and R.” We figured on the business plan that the first ten (10) years of operation you won’t have as many expenses because everything is brand new. At the ten (10) year mark you have to look around and see what is breaking down. It’s not like we can call facilities and say order me up a RTU, which we have fifteen (15) of, because they cost a lot of money and they could break any time. So we thought the payment would increase towards our contributions for the “R and R”. I think we have adjusted to the two (2) million bond payment, but we aren’t putting aside what we should have for “R and R.”*
3. Sam: How will loss of the Challenge Course affect revenue for future years?
*Judy: The Challenge Course generated revenue but was also subsidized by student fees. We audited the entire program and part of the audit looked at the annual amount of cost to run it. It usually cost about one hundred and thirty thousand (130,000) to one hundred and fifty thousand (150,000) annually to run the course. Approximately eighty thousand (80,000) was student activity fee dollars, so clearly they were generating around fifty thousand (50,000) a year a so from revenue of external user groups. Part of the analysis also showed that the number of external groups was sixty (60) to sixty- five (65) percent, so clearly student groups weren’t using it, and when they were we had to give them subsidies so they could use it. In the end, as stewards of student activity fee dollars, we had to ask what the benefit was to the students. We are able to gain some student activity fee dollars to the Outdoor Adventure Program which is getting more and more use from International and Year Two students who we are trying to retain. We figured it was better to put fees directly into student programing. We have not lost the service in terms of facilitating team building and community, because we can still do that at climbing wall and in the gym. We just won’t have high elements rope course. And now we can run it year-round because the low elements are still able to be replicated. Our goal is to attract more student groups so we don’t have to charge as much, because we don’t have to charge for a facility. So it won’t be a wash, because we still need to pay for a salary, but it will change. We need to increase beginner outdoor equipment. We need to augment that program, because we are using it for a dual purpose and it’s not the most effective way.*
4. Lance: What makes up line item thirty-six (36), Travel?
*Judy and Jennifer: Sports clubs. I actually don’t budget for full-time staff, I would say that about five hundred thousand (500,000) is always Sports Club. Because they travel across the country to compete, one year they traveled to Canada for that. Almost all of that is Sports Club and International Expedition. And that’s external revenue for the second one. For every dollar of student activity fee distributed to the student clubs, they raise about ten (10) dollars. So their money doesn’t come out of the student fee. We generate over one million (1,000,000) of revenue for the Rec Center to offset travel for the professional staff. So we try to generate revenue to not use student activity fee dollars.*
5. Jason: Reserve Fund numbers for Fiscal Year 2014 match, but in 2015 and 2016 it is off. This is for line reserve account balance, line sixty (60). The plant fund balance for strategic “R and R” isn’t matching.
*Judy: Oh you mean going across? 546,912 is the only one that matches.
Lyn: But Jason, they are good on that, because their budget fee was projected, and the Fiscal Year 2015 Projected closed up back to the Projected. So the Actual 2014 closed, and their resulting fund balance for 2015 closed to 2016.
Cody: Fiscal Year 2014 is the only one that’s actual; since we are in the middle of Fiscal Year 2015 it’s still technically projected. I have to manage this as projects come in. The difference is rounding interest to give the Board of Governors figures.*
6. Brandon: So looking forward, are there any big projects for the Rec Center in the next couple years?
*Cody: Define big. I’ve got a couple of fifty thousand (50,000) dollar projects which I consider big. At the moment, we have the smoothie bar and it will be renovated this semester into more of a lounge and a nice place for vending and plugging in your computer and such. When we redid the pool, we didn’t do the lights, so we need a contractor to come in with a lift and do the lights. We will also do a major revamp of the field lights. One of the things we did last year was that we put lights on the new volleyball courts and that cost us forty-five thousand (45,000). Everything is to enhance the building, and we couldn’t get everything we wanted in the renovation but we left room for future improvements.
Judy: In terms of planning, depending on what happens on the IM fields and the stadium, there may be some changes. There are all kinds of things that could happen. At Plum and Meridian, we thought about putting some low elements in the warmer weather. That would be only ten thousand (10,000) to twenty thousand (20,000). There are little things, but the major projects were covered by Cody.*
* **UFFAB (University Facility Fee Advisory Board)**
	+ Presenter: Sam Laffey [Vice Chair]
	+ I sent around two documents. One is a note from chair of UFFAB who couldn’t be here tonight due to an internship. It is a fiscal note about granting PVM students a fee cap on the fee increase, and the other is a note from the PVM Student Council requesting that exemption. So I’ll go over this fee cap, what it means, and why we did it.

The PVM students will not pay the fee increase that the board passed last year. We received a note requesting that the exemption take place; because PVM students are required to take above twenty-one (21) credit hours each semester, and there isn’t a way to get around it. It can range from twenty (20) to twenty-five (25) credits, and often is for fieldwork and practicums. So we spent most of the spring semester going over this request and consulted Rick Miranda and Amy Parsons. They agreed on it, because this is a very unusual fee. There is no other program like it on campus. We talked about exempting everyone else but decided not to because no one else has to take this many credits. Any other group that does above eighteen (18) credits does it by choice. The PVM students are forced to do it. Earlier this semester, UFFAB unanimously voted to approve this fee cap. The financial impact is predicted to have about eighty-seven thousand (87,000) of lost revenue each year, and will be less than one hundred thousand (100,000). If the world ends tomorrow, we have enough money in our balance to cover the loss.

* + Questions:
1. *Duane: So in the end of the world scenario, how many years can UFFAB absorb this?
Sam: It depends on a lot of things. Currently our fund balance is about eight hundred thousand (800,000), and we tend to allocate about four hundred thousand (400,000). We haven’t done that yet and so we don’t know how much we will allocate. We have been advised to allocate at the most four hundred thousand (400,000), but we have received over two (2) million to consider, so we have a lot and have only turned down one so far.
Steve: Let me clarify that this is the fee increase for the biology building in the Warner College, so the cap doesn’t inhibit the funding for that. So it’s not material to the ability to pay the debt when the bonds are left for these two projects.*
2. [Point of Information asking about which part of the fee they are exempt from]
*Sam: They will pay the regular fee increase up to eighteen (18) credit hours but not more than that.*
3. Andrew: Clarify that. So up to eighteen (18) hours they will be paying for the Biology increase, anything beyond that they are paying regular UFFAB fee?
*Sam: Yes. The only exemption is for the additional $5.75 per credit hour that went into the added fee increase.*
4. Andrew: This is a question for Steve and Lyn. Do you feel this will be setting a precedence that there could be another group on campus for a building that is being funded through UFAB? Could this become a regular occurrence?
*Lyn: I don’t think there are any other programs like this that have this situation. Could there be? We are always subject to change but we would have to go through a very detailed analysis. This letter came to the President’s desk but he gave it back to UFFAB to give the students the choice and to hear your perspective.*
5. Dinner—Pizza!
6. Old business
* Liaison and Constituent Input
	+ Jason: One of the questions asked to Jeremy was about the budget assumption for off-campus summer. They don’t get off-campus money at all.
	+ Yousef: I have been asking classmates about the split position for the Career Center and ALVS, and everyone is for it, it’s very popular.
	+ Nick: I want to give a follow-up from CRSCS, since they sent out a new budget sheet with number adjusted. A few notes, if you have the sheet in front of you it will make more sense. Salary savings on line twenty-nine (29): this reflects savings for Fiscal Year 2015, because they had an unsuccessful search which pushed the timeline/start date back. This caused the office to have some salary savings.
	Rioux: For clarification, we are looking at the new one in the email. Don’t look at old one. Ignore that sheet.
	Nick. Yeah. Second: concerning the student hourly increase. The increase is not additional funds, it is included within the twenty-seven (27) cent increase. It is a two (2) percent increase for student hourlies in the office, in order to recognize/retain student employees who do well. Also, the travel line shot up, and that’s because they had a substantial amount of travel from national searches (one for Dave’s position, and two for assistant associate directors). Lastly, under Additional Operating Expenses: there is an increase in additional cost because they were facilitating the searches, and there were contributions to Student Affairs for marketing and technology.
	+ Ryan: So if we can all go and think back to the WGAC: they were asking for increase for student hourly staff and Ref**ram**e. But there was a question about a twenty (20) percent salary savings for Assistant Director. Kathy was able to secure that, and the plan is to use those savings towards student hourly staff. But because this change has happened she may change the budget and not increase the student fee as much. We will be talking about that.

Andrew: I believe that I asked for the records in past SFRB to find out if the WGAC staffing was in the original funding idea.

Lance: Yep, we have it. Ryan was able to get the original New Fee Request, which was back in 2010 when it was initiated. They have the breakdown of the fee which was accepted. Section four (4) was for student hourly, and said it could be used to increase the student hourly workers in the office. So the IPVSF was created with the idea that it could help the WGAC. The previous SFRB decided that was fine.

* + Rioux: In terms of constituent input, I think it’s important for all of us to get it, but not give each other it every time. We are here to represent the input we get, not always explicitly state each feedback we get.

Andrew: I echo previous speaker. I don’t think we need a section for constituent input, but that when we are discussing potential increases we need to speak on behalf of our potential input. So if it’s going one direction, feel free to speak up about student who want it to go the other direction.

* ALVS: New Resource Request (Part One—Part Two continued on page 16)
	+ Andrew: I move to adopt the ALVS New Resource Request. [Second by Duane]. So this is going to be an awkward situation because we are going to work inside the ALVS request and Career Center request. So I would like to shift slightly, actually, and bring up Career Center Mandatory while working with this, if the chair approves. [The Chair approves]. In my opinion, Jeremy has done a great job with the Career Center. In past years he has really talked about how he brought the Career Center back from a tough place. He’s been extremely fiscally responsible and provides one of the best services we have available on campus. I see no reason to pass the increase now. So I would like to take a vote on the Mandatory Increase for the Career Center. [Seconded].
* Career Center: Mandatory
	+ (See Andrew’s Motion Above)
	+ Lance: Is there any discussion and debate? [No discussion and debate for the increase]. The increase would be seventy (70) cents? [Takes roll call vote. Brandon Earl and Sam Laffey and Sandra must abstain because they missed presentation, and Jason must also abstain. Emily, Luke, and Kelsey have voting rights given to them for this because they are Associates.] Vote of 19-0-4: that passes.
* Career Center: New Resource Request
	+ Andrew: I would like to consider Career Center New Resource Request in conjunction with ALVS New Resource Request. [Seconded]. I think this is the coolest things I have ever seen come across this floor. One of the big things about coming to university is to be prepared to go into the real world. And a lot of people don’t end up fulfilled with it. So I see a big benefit of the Career Community aspect, because for me I went undergrad as Computer Science, but with this opportunity I would have had a broader idea of what my skill sets could fit and the areas that were in desperate need of my skill set. I think it is huge and urge a yes very badly.

Sam: I sit on SMAC, and I can tell you from their presentation of the faculty council, there are few universities that do anything like this. They run this ship very well.

Andrew: While talking to Jeremy, one of the things he was enthusiastic about is the initial surge from Fund Balance and looking forward to actually having companies coming to sponsor him in the Career Community area to fund the initiative itself. Much like how off Campus Life allows sponsoring at the booths of the Housing Fair. They are thinking about the potential of a company like Kaiser working with the Health and Wellness group, for example. It is an opportunity for increased self-generated revenue.

Nick: I would add that in terms of thinking ahead, I like the idea of thinking it is us and just Stanford. So it is good because it won’t let them get all the glory for once, and it would be an awesome partnership to make a different in how higher education views interaction with industry. To ensure students coming to this campus can know what they want to do and also go out and do it well.

Jason: I think that being a forerunner, getting sponsorship from companies to run these is definitely a view that they are expecting to happen. It just needs to get up and running.

* + Rioux: Looking at this fee, keep in mind that their Projected will be another forty-nine (49) cent increase. This particularly obligates us the forty-nine (49) cent increase next year as well. Not that that is bad, but keep it in mind.

Lance: To provide some information to that point: what he came forward with, going back to our bylaws, shows that it is the hybrid model. He didn’t want it all in one year and instead wanted two.

Andrew: I talked to him specifically about that. Roughly looking at the forty-nine (49) cent for students, it will be about a thirty thousand (30,000) dollar increase, and between fifteen (15) Career Communities and the prospect of potentially getting sponsorship and partnering involved with that, if they had just one company sponsor in that area then they could take a huge chunk out of that. He put it in the presentation because that is what he pitched to Student Affairs, but he doesn’t know if he will come back with that because he wants it to be self-generated revenue.

Luke: So if he is trying to get sponsors next year, would avoiding giving him money now be a bad idea?

Jason: That was him saying that he would *have* to take it out of fund balance, not that he wanted to do that or would do it.

* + Sam: Also the new website has come out and it is pretty.
	+ Lance: The Chair would be open to a motion to enter discussion and debate on the Career Center New Resource Request? [Andrew so moves]. We are looking at a $1 increase. Moving into discussion and debate.

Andrew: Considering that these are together, I would like to move to vote to approve the New Resource Request for the Career Center contingent upon passing the New Resource Request for the ALVS fee as well. [Seconded].

Lance: Clarification—so if we pass the Career Center New Resource Request, we have to pass the ALVS one as well for the Career Center passing to go into effect. So we will be taking two votes. Is there any discussion and debate? [There is none]. We will now move into a roll call vote. [Takes Vote] That passes.

* ALVS NRR (Part Two):
	+ Rioux: I move for the passage of the ALVS New Resource Request [Seconded.]

Lance: So it would be fifty-eight (58) cent increase. Duane and Jason have to abstain. Emily, Luke, and Kelsey get to vote. Is there any discussion and debate? [There is none]. We will now move into a roll call vote. [Takes roll call vote.] That passes.

* CRSCS: Mandatory
	+ Scott: I would like to move into the CRSCS Mandatory. [Seconded]. I highly encourage a yes vote on this since it is mandatory.
	+ Lance: The mandatory is twenty-seven (27) cents. Is there any discussion and debate? [There is none]. Individuals who cannot vote: Grace, Emily, Nick, Rioux, and Luke. We will now move into a roll call vote. [Takes roll call vote.] That passes 13-7-3.
* IVSRF: New Resource Request
	+ Andrew: I move to table the IVSRF New Resource Request until we get the new budget and get the information on the new position that was funded. [Seconded].

Lance: We will now move into discussion and debate. [There is none]. We will now move into the vote. [Takes Aye or Nay vote.] That passes.

* IVSRF: Fiscal Note to Mandatory Fee Increase
	+ Andrew: Considering the new info that has come out, I move to rescind my motion on the Fiscal Note to the Mandatory Fee Increase for IVSRF.
* UCA: Mandatory
	+ Duane: I move to adopt the University Center for the Arts Mandatory Increase. [Seconded].
	+ Brandon (liaison for UCA): So I actually emailed Walt some more questions and he got back to me at 5:45 this evening with responses. Can I go through what he was talking about? [Approved]. So there was fourteen thousand (14,000) difference between Projected 2015 and Approved 2015 salary and benefits line. He said that fourteen thousand (14,000) increase was because they were having more student and non-student hourly wages above projected. So they’re only asking for about two thousand (2,000) over that, so that’s just mandatory.

A big change was the thirty thousand (30,000) increase in self-generated revenue, and that is direct result of giving free tickets to students. Because of that they ended up cutting funding out of general operating expenses to cover that deficit, and what they ended up doing is that they are thinking in the future the thirty thousand (30,000) increase will be compensated by more community members coming to productions. They are also hoping to recover that deficit through the partnership with The Lincoln Center, to bring patrons from TLC to the UCA.

One of my concerns was that they had little in fund balance in terms of reserve. Walt says he doesn’t think they need to hold a reserve because they could quickly just cut funding from one of the shows and that they are already being backed in funding with UCA.

Another group question was concerning the supplemental proposal for adding the new position and significantly increasing the materials and supplies budget. So he said that the responsibilities will differ depending on what the applicants bring to the table, because everything in the shop is in need of more oversight. So they see the production budget increasing for one hundred and fifty thousand (150,000) increase, and their plan is to come back next year for an additional increase. And if Administration was able to fund the new position, they will allocate the increase to go towards production materials because you can only recycle materials so much. They want to give the designers the opportunity to design what they need to.

Lance: Any more questions for Brandon?

Andrew: I have a question for Lyn. Can the UCA not carry a fund balance? Is that allowed?

Lyn: We have in our policy for student fees that we want the areas to carry a fund balance to about seven (7) to fifteen (15) percent, but there are a couple of areas where those don’t reply. Those areas are places where other things are coming into budget. Athletics and UCA, along with somewhere else I can’t remember, is covered in that. So I really don’t see a problem with them not having a fund balance.

Andrei: They didn’t give the viewership numbers they said they would include, or how many people pay versus don’t pay for tickets?

Brandon: He didn’t send me specific numbers. Again, they’re only doing the free tickets for a few nights and specific productions, so most of the tickets are paid. I want to say it was about fifty-fifty split for students and community members going to these productions, just based off of what Walt said last week.

Question from board: Are they increasing the fee to improve the quality of the program? Or is it because of that person who came in and they instead feel like they deserve more?

Brandon: The person coming in to evaluate is showing that they do have a tight operations budget. They are asking for the increase because they think they could improve the area significantly by providing students the tools to make larger and higher quality productions, and the new position to help train the students better. So I think it is to improve the program and not just because they deserve more.

Andrew: A large portion of the funds go towards putting on the shows. So increasing the fund would increase the prop quality and the sheer amount they are able to do. One of the stopping gaps is a lack of resources to run shows constantly. If they increased those resources, they could increase shows, which would increase involvement opportunities, which means more real-life skills for students across campus.

* + Lance: Are there any more questions for Brandon? [There are none] We are now entering discussion and debate.

Rioux: I would really like to use tabling for this.

Luke: I had a minimal amount of input, mostly indifferent, but I had one peer tell us to invest in it because he thinks the sheer work ethics of people doing it means that they work enough to deserve it.

Kelsey: So I would actually go against this, because I have done programs there, and there are not a lot of multi-cultural parts in terms of acting and vocal programs. Me being Jewish, and a lot of other members of their programs, we were actually insulted by the ways they handled the vocal aspects of it. The only songs they ever sing are Christian songs, and they refused to incorporate Hanukkah songs even though we asked. I also think that for the presentation they had, he wasn’t very specific what kind of person he wanted to hire. He said it was the shop but that he wasn’t sure where he wanted to place them. So if we did vote yes, we should ask for a more specific persona and idea. And I know that a lot of the shows are very great at the moment, but those being at the UCA doesn’t benefit a majority of the students at school. I think tabling it and maybe asking for other viewpoints would be great, because it doesn’t benefit everyone, and even after I participated I would not do so again because of how I felt.

Nick: So on the UCA webpage, we can go to their mission. And in the first line, they say they are dedicated to music/theatre/art/dance in general, and what was presented last week was mainly theatre. It felt like the theatre department was coming forward, not the actual UCA coming forward saying how it could benefit all the program offerings. Last year, I don’t think Walt come in and presented, and there was a lot more talk about everything the UCA does. They talked about dance and jazz ensembles and concert groups, and they gave a much better view of what the UCA stands for and what the funds go to and how they can be applied. So I’m not sure if I’m comfy with voting on any fee increase (Mandatory or New Resource Request), because we don’t have a good idea of how it impacts the student body as a whole. I would also like to say on the New Resource Request, even though I know we are discussing Mandatory right now, that it seems weird that just one department would go after that instead of the UCA as a whole. It seemed less of the UCA coming forward, and more of the theatre department coming here instead. Just wanted to add.

Yohana: Going off of what Kelsey said, a lot of offices talk about diversity at CSU and I’m very hesitant about how some offices actually do that. So when Walt came in, I was hesitant about the possible acts for the next year and the programs that didn’t embody the multicultural idea. Even the jazz players and artists didn’t embody what the UCA should embody. Also from what I have gathered speaking to constituents within the art program, they feel they don’t have the opportunity to express their own style in the arts. They are unable to speak to their directors and be open to them because they are stuck in a culture that the director has and the images they want for the UCA. So I don’t know if these increases would help all students on the campus or those who are already accelerating in the program.

Andrei: Going through bylaws of SFRB, it seems this conflicts with the alignment to land-grant mission statement, which I’ll briefly quote as saying it should be an “extension for the benefit of the citizens of Colorado, United States, and the world.” So if the UCA theatre department is sidestepping in providing homage to multicultural aspects of faiths, I think that is a violation of the extension of the benefit part of the land-grant statement. And the position’s vagueness, this is point six (6), lacks the qualitative and quantitative information. Seeing how much the thirty thousand (30,000) dollar decrease –which is a 13.33% decrease— is huge, and that they can’t provide statistics to that is huge issue, plus the vagueness of the position isn’t outlined properly, and he didn’t specify why he should give us those reasons, I urge a no vote if we do vote. That is, if don’t table it tonight.

Andrew: Brandon, how much were you involved in this presentation?

Brandon: Not at all.

Andrew: Ok. So Walt has been on sabbatical and I don’t know what went on with the presentation because normally Walt is much better. I would love to extend the opportunity for him to come back with more what we are looking for, in terms of multicultural groups and where the money is going and how they support a ton of students on campus. There are a ton of questions that have been brought up here and I think the easiest way is for them to come back in and present some of the answers. I would like to invite them back with a list of questions to have answered, and have it be a very pointed presentation.

Lance: To invite them back does not require a vote. If we vote no, it is a majority vote to bring them back.

Nick: Point of information. Is Walt the fee area director?

Lance: Yes.

Brandon: Bryce J. is actually the man sitting in for Walt this semester. From what I know he has been focusing on his main job right now, and Walt is running the show from behind the scenes.

Lance: So with that, since we don’t need a vote, we can either vote on this or table it. I think we should bring him back the on the 23rd [of March], right after spring break.

Rioux: Looking at what they are requesting, which is $31,500 and $38,650 for production materials, I would like to see a separate resource request for both of those. So that if the technical is funded by the Dean it doesn’t all go into materials.

Brandon: To speak to that, Walt in his email is saying if Administration would fund this position they would roll that money into the materials/supplies budget and would not ask for a large increase next year, because their plan is to ask for another increase next year.

Rioux: Yeah, the only thing I’m thinking is that they are asking for the smaller amount this year, and I don’t want them to be lumped into one thing. That’d how we envisioned the new bylaw change.

Jason: It think one thing to look at is that one of our sister campuses have a higher fee rate, and even with the increase theirs is still higher than ours. We are still running the UCA at a lower budget than our sister campuses. We are producing eight (8) times worth of what CU Boulder is, and doing it with very little. I think increasing it even the slight bit they are asking for is ok. And everyone is saying that giving the students tickets free is a problem, but shouldn’t we want more of those so that students don’t need to pay to go there?

* + Andrew: Considering questions that have been proposed and taken down by the clerk, I would like to table these for tonight and extend the invitation to Walt to come in to present. I would like to make that a motion. [Seconded].

Point of order [Unknown Speaker]: We never did the vote for the mandatory. So do we need to vote on that first?

Duane: If we did the vote, and then put a no vote, couldn’t we have them come back with a more clear presentation?

Lance: No. A vote of no confidence in a Mandatory does not deny it but instead brings us into discussion. So if we vote right now, the mandatory gets approved and we just leave notes for next year.

Scott: Point of personal privilege, can we table this due to time?

Lance: Any further discussion or debate? [There is none]. Ok, so we need to vote on UCA mandatory.

Rioux: If we pass the mandatory, can we request him to come back for New Resource Request?

Evan: Hold on, can the clerk go back and find original motion that way we know what we are voting on? [Duane was the original person to make the motion.]

Lance: Since Duane did it, he has to rescind it before we can vote to table it.

Duane: I move to rescind my previous motion. And I move to table this. [Seconded]

Lance: Any discussion and debate? [There is none]. We will now move into a vote for tabling the UCA. [Takes Aye or Nay vote]. That passes.

* UCA: New Resource Request
	+ Tabled (see above)
1. Adjournment

Lance LiPuma adjourned the meeting at 7:35PM with an Aye vote that passed.

Minutes submitted by: Michelle Sogge

Minutes approved by: [Name]