**Associated Students of Colorado State University**

**Forty-Fourth Senate**

**Fifteenth Session**

**December 10th, 2014**

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge
3. Roll Call
4. Gallery Input
	* Lauren: I have been working with some students to create designated smoking areas on campus. We want to get second hand smoke away from the center of campus but allow those who smoke to be able to. We got about 189 signatures online. I want to open this to your consideration.
5. Consent Agenda
	* Bondi: I move to approve the consent agenda.
		1. Vote: 23.0.0
	* 12.3.14 Minutes
6. Guest Speakers
	* Rick Miranda: Tonight, Dr. Frank was supposed to be here. Today Tony got rather ill and couldn’t make it. He asked me to come and talk about the budget with you all. It’s the time of year when we head into serious discussions about next year’s fiscal budget. We have a budget at the university Education in General budget which is about 40% of the entire budget. 400 million of that is our research contracts. Another big chunk of the budget are things like the parking revenues and housing and dining expenses. They are run as a separate part. The Education in General pays the GTAs, the buildings, etc. We have a 400 million dollar budget. As with most budgets, we have revenues coming in and expenses going out. Our revenues match our expenses. Our two main sources of revenues are tuition and state appropriation. Of that 400 million dollars, we have expenses and revenues. How do we manage that transition from this year to next year? What will be the changes in our revenues and expenses? We develop this budget starting with a skeleton budget and we guess what we are thinking we will receive and what we will need to pay. We start out with some assumptions. Some increments of tuition numbers and salary increase. We are limited by 6% nonresident undergraduate tuition. We will increase some areas and keep other areas the same. We make these assumptions as the maximum allowed. On the tuition side, we would expect from undergrad tuitions about 11 million more than last year. 4.8 million dollars is the amount we collected this year but have not budgeted. We projected a flat enrollment and we received more than we expected. There were more residents than nonresidents. Next year we want to budget this. Graduate tuitions we might collect another 900 thousand. It gives us about 18 million more dollars than we got this year. The 5 million dollars is what we are using as a guess of what we will get from the state. Last year, we received close to 10 million dollars. This year we think we might not be so lucky and only get 5. The other half a million dollars is the amount that goes in to the general fund when writing grants. We take the extra money and use it for the overhead. It uses resources of the university and we charge the grant some. All told, it looks like with these assumptions, we might enjoy 27.3 more millions dollars than what we had last year. Every percent of tuition is about 1 million dollars.
		1. Seel: Looking at how there is some increase in tuition funds, why do you still recommend the full 6% increase?
			1. Miranda: We are just modeling it. That’s not a rate increase, just a volume increase.
	* Miranda: In the first category, I want you to notice that we try to spend the exact amount of money that we have coming in. This first line, the enrollment growth is related to the 4.8 million because we have more students. What I have arranged in the budget is a formulaic equation for that. I use those resources to fund the core curriculum. The 1/3 is being used to pay some other bills. The next line is the financial aid inflation of 3 million. When we increase tuition, we are obligated to increase financial aid. Tuition sharing programs is the next line. We promise to send 27% of that back to the PVM program if we increase tuition. The next line is the graduate student tuition pool. We pay GTA’s a stipend and their tuition. Salaries is the biggest line with a rather small increase. One of the critical jobs I have is to hire good faculty. We are in competition with hundreds of other universities all over the country. When we hire more faculty, we have to pay competitive salaries. We have had modest salary increases of 2-3%. When faculty is promoted, they get a special raise. Our fringe benefits, we have retirement benefits and those are the lowest of all of our peers. We have made a goal to increase that by 3%. Other mandatory costs is a big number. When the utility and electricity bills go up, we have to pay the bill. Is it discretionary at some level? Yes. We are looking at ways to conserve but at some point you have to be clear eyed and estimate what the bill will be. When we bring new buildings, we have to budget the additional heating and lighting to bring to those buildings. Debt service, when we borrow money, we have to pay the interest. Health care for graduate students, it’s a modest amount. We have not been paying their health care 100% and we want to pay all of it. They are projecting a rate increase for everyone. Finally, we would like to do some extra good things and hire new faculty and staff to do some new initiatives. We estimate 6 million dollars on new enhancements. We have a long list. It was due today or tomorrow of their proposals of what they would like for new initiatives of what they want to fund with this. In late January, we will have our budget retreat and will try to make decisions shortly after. Unfortunately that adds up to about 3.5 million dollars more going out than coming in. Many numbers may change. We will just have to ask units on campus to contract a little bit if push comes to shove. There are other ways to handle it. We don’t quite have a full understanding of a balanced budget.
	What about tuition? We would like it to be lower. It probably won’t go below the 3%. State appropriations, we plugged in a number what happened 2 years ago. Recent conversations have led us to believe it might go north of that. We would like to do more in the financial aid line. Salary increase would cost about 3 million dollars. This enrollment growth funding represents students are here but are not budgeted for. As I said, we made a promise to plow 2/3 of that back into the colleges. It’s being caused by instructional pressure and will give that money to that. We have lots of great ideas for quality enhancement. We will probably collect from the deans about 20 million dollars of ideas. We will have to be discerning about what we can fund. I’m hoping those internal reallocations will be okay.
		1. Bondi: Are you planning on projecting for a flat enrollment growth?
			1. Miranda: Yes we are planning on that but are expecting it to be better than flat so that we can have extra rather than less.
		2. Seel: Is the university looking at trying to increase the enrollment to 35,000 students?
			1. Miranda: Yes, but we have taken our foot off the gas. There was state funding that went from 130 million to 85 million from the state. Now it’s starting to go up again. We can enjoy a more natural growth now. That number is our max amount.
			2. Seel: The limit you’re looking at is a space concern vs resource concern?
				1. Miranda: Space and infrastructure issues. The resource issue would have helped drive tuition revenue instead of state appropriations. That would take that pressure off trying to replace that.
		3. Gallery: Did you ever think about sponsoring the alternative energy mechanisms?
			1. Miranda: Yes we have been very active in that. We have been one of the first to establish this. That has helped stabilize funding. We looked at a wind farm and continue to look at energy efficiency when we can. We have 6 million square feet on campus and try to install efficient lighting. Heating is a large cost and we are looking at trying to conserve that as well.
		4. Christensen: Is there any increase in marketing to out of state students?
			1. Miranda: Yes we hired someone to live in southern California last year to recruit and are hoping to do this again.
		5. Li Puma: During the spring semester, what would be the best way for students to add input?
			1. Miranda: The best way is to pay attention. We have open forums scheduled almost every month about the latest version of the numbers. In the next moment, the last Wednesday in January, we have a budget retreat and then we will have more events later in the semester where we will know more and more each time. We will eventually send it to the board of governors and they will approve our budget.
	* Jake Christensen, Director of Governmental Affairs, and Sarah Bruce, Deputy Director of Governmental Affairs:
		1. Christensen: We are going over another budget issue. This is the budget for higher education. They released a preliminary budget recently. This bill aimed at improving how the funding was funded. This is kind of a way to give background to house bill 1419.
		2. Bruce: This report is a briefing that the joint budget implemented. The model is vague of what will happen after that. They will see what changes need to be made after 2015 and 2016. This is important to know how things are changing in the model. Higher education Colorado is funded in the means for contracting. The needs are becoming so independent that student tuition is a fee. Higher education will be looked at as more of a public good. This adds a normative aspect to higher education. This will switch to value based contracting. Right here, the page says once all funding is accounted for, each governing board will receive 10-15% increase in funding. The bill directly addresses state contributions. According to the model, 52.5% state allocated funds goes to the college opportunity fund. The model discusses the criteria in which the funding will be based. This information is not technically final. It is suspected the final model will be quite similar. Here we have a general funding allocations model. We will focus on the ones that apply directly to us. 52.5% need to go to college opportunity fund. 56% of funds will go to COF stipend per credit hour. This exceeds the percent. This table focuses more on role and admission funding. It breaks down the funding on roll admission. CSU will receive 22 million dollars in role admission funding. When taking into the account the amount the university should recieve, the amount of campuses is taken into account. We have performance funding. We see institution funding models. CSU is easy to compare to others in certain areas of funding.
			1. Crites: Per percentage in each category, every university will be getting the same amount as a school identical to us? Where do the numbers come from?
				1. Christensen: Based on performance, yes.
				2. Bruce: Remediation. This model, the JBC will look at the criteria at our school and CU. If we had higher success rates, we would receive funding according to that.
				3. Christensen: The main goal was to increase transparency.
			2. Bondi: Is GPA being used as a bench marker?
				1. Bruce: The way I understand it is that the purpose of this model is to target areas where universities need to improve.
				2. Christensen: There are factors for performance. Work force, achievement gap, etc. The main two are completion and retention.
				3. Bondi: Has there been conversation around universities watering down the system to push more people through?

Christensen: I’m sure that’s happened but I haven’t heard anything about that.

Bruce: This was a really quick process.

Christensen: They did public forums about it. The whole metric system was made up by CFOs of universities.

* + - 1. Hansen: This is the same system the CCHU was setting up where the colleges could select areas for improvement to get funding based on this?
				1. Bruce: The only change is that universities cannot choose which performance indicators they want to improve on.
				2. Hansen: I used to be a part of the CCHE and they discussed this thing and created a table could select certain areas they needed to improve for funding.
				3. Bondi: What Representative Hansen is referring to, there was a conversation about performance mechanisms to create certain funding for certain performance metrics and they took those ideas and came up with this.
			2. Seel: There’s a shift from it being a service based funding, what was the reasoning of the shift?
				1. Bruce: It’s employed by a firm that provides a service. Upon paying that fee, the institution can continue on providing that service. It was becoming a very private and secluded process. The idea here is increasing accessibility. As soon as higher education becomes a public good, there will be more increase in positive areas in the community.
				2. Seel: If you’re looking at how these performances are graded, are they geared towards different resources universities have? Can this hurt smaller institutions?

Bruce: I do think the fact that all of these metrics are transferable, all universities have to live up to this expectation to get the same amount of funding.

1. Ratification & Swearing in of New Members
	* Gabby Greenberg, Assistant Director of Finance
		1. 22.6.0
	* Nick Dannemiller, Associate Justice
		1. 26.0.2
	* Laffey: I move to suspend the dress code.
		1. Vote: 26.0.2
2. Executive Reports
	* Whitesell: Tobacco task force meeting is tomorrow. The petition that was created was forwarded to me yesterday. It was formed at the end of last semester to share data of student voices to make final recommendations. Cams Crew applications for spring are up on the website. If you have any friends interested, let them know. Mental health committee is finalizing our posters and they are looking really great. Next semester we will be changing our meeting times. If you’re interested in joining, let me know. The assistant directors of health have created a video of mindfulness and stress tips. We want to get health messages out to our students.
	* Wester: Mackenzie and I met this morning to make a draft of the student sick day policy. We have a meeting to try to keep going on that. We are going forward with the student honor code.
	* Wells: The Inclusive Excellence Committee will be in full swing in the spring. If you are interested in being on the committee, come to us. We are moving forward in partnering with some individuals to create a faith fair to share a space to openly reflect on their faith and meet students common to them. MLK day has a lot of cool events here in Fort Collins.
	* Guinn: Giving Tuesday had the largest campaign push on one day for one organization. They ran into a woman who donated 5,000 dollars. We are sitting under 12,000 dollars for Rams against Hunger. It is before the stadium on the alumni giving website. We are planning on rolling this out and toying with the idea of lowering the amount of meals and giving to more students or less students with more meals.
	* McArthur: The retreat will be January 24th from 9-3.
	* Block: Winter Bike to Work Day was this morning. Thanks to all who came. We served over 350 people. We had a lot of community members. I will let you know once we find out the standings on that.
	* Gurau: We got the election committee applications. You can run to be an appointed member but not an elected member if you are on that committee.
3. Judicial Reports
	* Jordan: We are having a court meeting tomorrow to discuss what the elections committee and elections manager can do after the committee. If you have any recommendations, let us know. We are continuing the Sergeant at Arms application period up until the 2nd week of break.
4. Senator Reports
	* Seel: We went over the effective losses of parking due to construction projects. We will lose a large amount with the stadium. It is planned to be recovered with a parking garage. We are looking at roughly a 2,600 loss of parking spaces. They are looking at building a surface lot.
		1. Bondi: What percentage of parking available is that?
			1. Crites: He didn’t say a percent but the Moby lot is always full. UCA lots are not always full because they are inconvenient.
		2. Seel: With the building of the stadium, the stadium will occupy nearly all of the parking lots on the west side of meridian. The C lot will be at the top of Center. Fees will increase. Parking Services does not have enough money to have enough construction. This will bring us up about 1500 spaces with the 2 lots.
			1. Nolan: Are the A lots staying faculty?
				1. Seel: All tiered parking will be available to everyone but faculty gets first priority.
			2. Jordan: The parking lot across from Aylesworth, will it stay?
				1. Seel: It’ll stay.
			3. D: I move to extend the time till 8:30.
		3. Seel: With the stadium, they will be utilizing existing parking lots.
		4. Crites: They were thinking about bringing up a time for free parking after 10pm. In addition to the parking lots, there will be an existing night time parking permit for 75 dollars a year.
		5. Olson: It’ll be 7 dollars a month to park in the evening.
		6. Seel: If the reason the parking garage is to build spaces, it is because of the cost of 1 space is so expensive so it’ll cost around 33 million dollars to build.
		7. Bondi: Will there be a decrease in amount of permits?
			1. Seel: Yes, they will try to keep roughly a 15% surplus of parking spaces. They aren’t trying to push people away.
		8. Watson: The construction will be when?
			1. Seel: This summer.
	* Laffey: I was at the Committee of athletics, and we still need grad school senators. There are two ways they will get money. Boise State is going to Fiesta Bowl. Half will go to the Boise. 3 million dollars will be split between the 11 schools. We are going to the royal purple bowl on December 20th in Vegas. It’s about 1.2 million dollar total. It includes the amount of money of tickets that are sold and we have to pay for our travel expenses.
		1. Maher: We will have to recoup tickets that are not sold. If you pay 10 dollars, you are footing the bill for a military individual to attend.
5. Associate Senator Reports
6. Confidence Business
7. Committee Reports
	* Internal Affairs
		1. Seel: For Internal committee, we didn’t have any bills to talk about but we talked about Senator Laffey’s PR bill and there were concerns in my committee. We had conversations about what ASCSU’s roles were in regards to student health and food and we had conversations about what ASCSU should do to provide healthier food options.
	* External Affairs, Crites: This is the first reading of the bill so there are no amendments yet. The presentation we got earlier about institutional funding said metrics used to assess. We want things to be fair. So we changed that to offer constructive criticism. They used the word equal and standardized and they addressed all of those. We sent it to a couple more people.
	* University Issues, Dugger: Res #4415 CSU Citizen Review Board. The changes we made were minor, grammatical or adding people to the endorsers list. We discussed a lot and would like to see it go places.
8. Old Business
	* Res #4415 CSU Citizen Review Board
		1. Seel: I motion to bring Res 4415 to the floor.
		2. Bigham: I consent to read the title (no dissent).
		3. Bondi: I move to adopt the amendments proposed by the committee.
			1. Bondi: I move to previous question.
				1. Vote: 22.0
			2. Vote: 22.0
		4. Maher: I amend the word “officers” will be changed to personnel.
			1. Maher: This is one of the things I addressed last week that by stating “officers” we would remove bike police. This will make sure it applies to everyone that works in the police department.
			2. Sydoriak: This is something I meant to do in the committee and we wanted to change it to this, so I endorse this.
			3. Vote: 22.0.0
		5. Sydoriak: I know there are a few reservations out there. But in regards to what this board might look like, I got an email from the staff attorney Forest and he already asked to be the advisor for this board. There are things in motion to get this committee successful. This discussion will be out in the open to have a democratic mechanism being formed through another democratic mechanism.
		6. Crites: CSUPD are state classified. There is a review process in place that goes through our human resource system, is this possible we already have something like this?
			1. Sydoriak: Currently, yes there is an oversight. These are people that are not trained and just people Amy Parsons relies on. There is some sort of process that is within the administration, never any students. They want to keep it that way that no one knows about it. This board would be non-binding, we aren’t trying to force their hand but just campus body input as leverage for our voice up against the administration. Not in a hurtful way, but to balance the power on campus.
			2. Crites: The main difference is making it more of a third party investigation with people who aren’t trying to save their job?
				1. Sydoriak: Yes it would be an objective autonomous body. Individuals on the board would not have that bias to keep jobs.
		7. Laffey: In regards to we already have a process in place, I’m concerned that bringing human resources into the public is not great for state personnel.
		8. Nolan: I fully support this bill. There should always be student input.
		9. Seel: In reference to previous speaker, I don’t think that considering the misuse of authority would be an issue. This would be having a democratic process of the police department. Having the input of the people they are responsible for is necessary for a functioning government.
		10. Sydoriak: These cases are confidential. It’s through the newspapers if they get out to the public. No information gets out unless the police department lets it out.
		11. Bondi: With the creation of this board, it gives us another avenue and an impactful means for community involvement and whether or not an instance involves HR or just a conversation and reformation from it. The only time anything puts on your record in HR, is seen as negative. If it’s severe enough in this case, this would give more openness and opportunity.
		12. Hansen: Just because they are state classified, it doesn’t mean there is state oversight. The reason they are state certified is because we are a state institution. This is our house and are state certified within our house. For people who feel they have been assaulted or their rights taken, it might be intimidating to go to the same department that they felt slighted by. Having a group of people to go to, gives a more comfortable setting.
		13. Sydoriak: If anyone has seen the article about the citizen review board, any additional oversight would be invaluable. I find that insulting that we as community members do not add value. Our input and we watching each other’s backs is valuable. It would just take the load off their hands but we are having people that can represent this community better to take a look at it. We see that time and time again. This is one bit of oversight to help ensure that doesn’t happen seamlessly.
		14. Maher: Vigilant oversight is proper duty. It is meant to be the eyes and the voice of its constituents. Our goal is to inform the student’s and make sure there is oversight of governing bodies over CSU.
		15. Watson: I move to previous question.
			1. Vote: 23.0.0
		16. Vote: 23.0.0
9. New Business
	* Bill #4410 Creating an ASCSU Senate Public Relations Manager
		1. Laffey: I move to table Bill #4410.
			1. Laffey: It was brought to my attention that there are several errors that need to be corrected and I want to fix it myself before wasting Senate’s time.
			2. Vote: 22.1.0
	* Res #4416 ASCSU Executive Bylaws
		1. Bondi: I move to adopt Res #4416.
		2. Nolan: It came to my attention that the Executive branch could not find any executive bylaws. I wanted to have this in place to have a gentle push to write some. I think they could help in some ways. This is not binding but rather my opinion on the matter. I would appreciate it to be put on expedited status.
		3. Bondi: I think this is a great idea. But I move to put it on expedited status.
			1. Sydoriak: I think it’s time we put the executives feet to the fire.
			2. Vote: 22.0.1
		4. Bondi: I feel it would be in the parliamentarian’s job description to make small grammatical changes.
		5. Laffey: I move to previous question.
			1. Vote: 17.3.3
		6. Vote: 23.0.0
	* Res #4417 Resolution Improving Outcome Based Funding Model
		1. Bondi: I move to adopt Res #4417.
		2. Christensen: Most of the resolution is pretty self-explanatory. I will go over the goals. The first part saying the amount of funding related to the performance metric is not equal. That doesn’t mean money given, but percentages. The other point is that this model does not include the current rate of tuition that in the document this point being something they acknowledge and need to include. The other point was the increase in funding from fiscal year 14-15 to 15-16. Its currently 16%. Within the document, they have guard rails, saying no institution can have more than the maximum and minimum. The main goal is to use this to have a presence when lobbying. We want to bring this to them to see that we acknowledge this and this is what we want from CSU.
			1. Maher: The percentages up there, where do they come from?
				1. Christensen: The document. The total allocation of money comes from performance metric. The proportion of your performance metric is not equal. The total allocation is coming from performance.
				2. Maher: Is there a hard number per student?

Christensen: Approximately, it was 5,000 dollars we receive per student and some others are getting 8 or 7 thousand.

* + - * 1. Maher: Is this a direct result of the allocation?

Christensen: Yes. A lot of the total costs come from the state.

* + - 1. Jordan: How is the breakdown currently decided?
				1. Christensen: It’s based on the weighted averages of what degrees of completion and retention. Adjusting that model to put more weight towards certain degrees, would change that.
				2. Jordan: Are the other schools using the same standards?

Christensen: Yes it’s standard across the board. They could change by school.

* + - 1. Watson: If this is a proportion of the total money we receive, we are 3rd, and it seems we are receiving more money in general. Why would we be trying to equalize?
				1. Christensen: Equalize on options that we are not equal. The performance metrics aren’t equalized. Our amount per student is a lot lower than other universities.
			2. Laffey: Overall, if the purpose of this bill is accomplished, it will benefit CSU?
				1. Christensen: Correct.
			3. Jefri: Is there a financial analysis that has been done to show we will benefit?
				1. Christensen: Yes, the whole objective is to get more money. As Dr. Miranda was saying earlier, a lot of our money comes from the state by equalizing the performance rate. But there is no financial analysis. Logically it would increase but there’s no exact dollar amount. That goes back to the overall goal of this resolution to increase the funding.
			4. Lynch: If the problem is with a flat dollar amount, why are expressing it with percentages?
				1. Christensen: By saying which part we want money from. They are directly from the amount of we are receiving. This is a recommended model. This is the base model. We do have exact dollar amounts. It’s more attacking ideas and parts of the model than exact dollar amounts.
		1. Jordan: Since this bill is trying to get us more money, the idea is we raise the percentage in certain areas by not reducing the amount in other parts.
		2. Li Puma: I move to put this on expedited status.
			1. Vote: 20.0.2
		3. Sydoriak: If we pass this tonight, is this something that can be worked on over break? Will this have implications between now and the next senate?
			1. Christensen: Yes, we will be meeting the first week of January.
		4. Maher: If we look at those percentages, per student we are receiving less than other student’s. Our merits are there and we should push to be judged upon this because we are killing it right now. If you receive school size, they are receiving more per students.
		5. Vote: 22.0.1
1. Announcements
	* Watson: I got some more money for the festival. As of today, by January 1st, our website will be up and live.
	* Williams: Finals are stressful. 7-9pm at Braiden we are having an open mic night to relieve some of that stress.
	* Olson: Free coffee next Monday on the plaza.
2. Roll Call
3. Adjournment