

Incidental Fee Committee
Minutes

Meeting #10
March 3, 2017 12pm
Room 207, Richard Woodcock Education Center

1. Call to Order

The meeting is called to order at 12:06pm by Carter Craig, IFC Chair.

2. Roll Call

IFC Members: Caleb Tingstad, Brian Tesch, Asia Cohen, Caroline Basso, Shelby Worthing, Lindsey Marquardt, and Emily Searls.

IFC Chair: Carter Craig

Advisors:

Area Heads: Carey Gilbert, CDC Director; Patrick Moser, Student Engagement; David Janoviak, Creative Arts; Adry Clark, Service Learning & Career Development; Aislinn Addington, Abby's House; Rhys Finch, Student Media; Rip Horsey, Campus Recreation; and Deborah Diehm, WOLF Ride.

Other Representatives: Rachel Gries, ASWOU Senator; Jocelyn Chavez, Anthropology Club; Lilly Miranda, Anthropology Club; Kathryn Sinor, Anthropology Club; Glen Harris, Athletics; Randi Lydum, Athletics; Cynthia Olivares, ASWOU President; Brandon Neish,

3. Approval of Minutes

a. February 24, 2017

Asia Cohen moves to approve the minutes for February 24, 2017. Caroline Basso seconds the motion. No discussion. The motion passes 8-0-0.

4. Approval of the Agenda

Caleb Tingstad moves to approve the agenda. Emily Searls seconds the motion. No discussion. The motion passes 8-0-0.

5. Old Business

6. New Business

a. Anthropology Club – Travel request

Kathryn Sinor, Anthropology Club Historian, explains that their past president failed to budget their annual conference. They are a career club and the conference offers a great opportunity to network. In the past they have brought back the conference information by speaking directly to students in anthropology classes. They provided a spreadsheet breaking down their available funds and the conference costs. They would like to use \$384 from services & supplies, \$70.60 from travel, and also have \$217 from their foundation account. They are hoping to

host another 3 bake sales and will be covering some expenses on their own. They will be traveling with 9 students and will need 2 hotel rooms for two nights since the conference is in Spokane, Washington.

Gary Dukes notes that their club spreadsheet shows they have \$300 in travel but they are only showing \$79.60. Adela Aguilar, IFC Secretary, explains that the club paid FY16 travel costs out of their FY17 allocation and therefore have significantly less of their allocation available. The club is asking for approval to take the trip since it was not previously budgeted and they are also asking to use their services & supplies allocation to help fund it.

Brian Tesch asks about the size of the hotel rooms since they will only be booking 2 rooms for 9 participants. Kathryn responds that they will be getting rooms with 2 queen size beds per room and participants will need to share. They will have 4 in one room and 5 in the other, the fifth person will sleep on a cot. Gary Dukes asks what the club will no longer be doing if they use their services & supplies allocation for the trip. Kathryn explains that it is her first year so she is still learning. Services & supplies would normally go towards events and such but the club members have been contributing from personal funds to help the club thrive.

Caleb Tingstad moves to approve the Anthropology Club travel request. Emily Searls seconds the request.

Discussion

Caleb Tingstad notes that the reallocation is a positive once since they are a career club and it is beneficial for the campus as a whole. Carter Craig appreciated the dedication to attending the conference in their fundraising efforts as well as having several members present at the meeting. The motion passes 8-0-0.

b. Student Feedback review

Carter Craig, IFC Chair, informs the Committee that it is important to review the student feedback received at open hearings and tableing.

Carter Craig notes that tableing at the same times the second week is not beneficial; students seem to have a scheduled path. Many students seemed surprised after learning what was funded by the fee. While they thought the fee was high they also felt there were a lot of services rendered; high cost but equally high value. There was concern about the cuts to ASWOU and the impact on clubs.

Emily Searls notes that she heard a lot of the same things. There was a lot of concerns in regards to ASWOU, students noted there were a couple small cuts but ASWOU was by far the largest.

Caleb Tingstad notes that he also received a lot of the same feedback. ASWOU was a big talking point. During open hearings some of the student athletes

expressed that they felt the cut to athletics was acceptable, many thought they deserved one.

Brian Tesch notes that several clubs were concerned about the ASWOU cuts. It is important to note that while he heard a lot in regards to cuts to clubs he did not hear much about the direct ASWOU cuts. There were questions in regards to the sizes of the cuts and why cuts were not even across the board.

Lindsey Marquardt notes that she tabled between 4:00-5:00pm and it was a bad time to do so. She tried to mention the fee in conversations outside the Werner University Center (where IFC members tabled). She found that a lot of students did not know what ASWOU was but they did know some of the other departments. At open hearings, they heard a lot from clubs because they are involved students. People seemed to be ok with the cut to athletics. She adds that some students felt the cuts were made on a whim.

Shelby Worthing notes that the students at the open hearings were primarily students who were being affected so their feelings were more personal. The students during tableing were looking at a broader picture. She suggests maybe doing outreach before the preliminary decision, in the future, so students can form a general opinion. She heard a lot about clubs and ASWOU. During the breakout sessions she explained and fielded questions about the overall process.

Asia Cohen notes was unable to table and only goes into the Werner University Center to meet up with a specific person or to get food. One thing that was interesting was seeing more students showing up at open hearings than to events. Asia got student feedback in the Richard Woodcock Education Center, Admissions office, Science department, and the Hamersly Library.

Caroline Basso notes that due to illness she was unable to attend either of the open hearings or table. However, what she heard from her friends was concern over the ASWOU budget and how it would impact clubs.

Lindsey Marquardt adds that when she asked how students felt about the overall fee most people were ok with the minimal increase. They understood that increases were to be expected.

Rachel Gries asks if it would be appropriate for her to speak to her experience tableing about the fee. Carter Craig confirms it is. Rachel notes that she heard a lot of the same feedback. Many were concerned about that ASWOU clubs. Music majors asked that she relay to the Committee that they did not want cuts to Creative Arts because concerts are required for some of their classes.

Shelby Worthing notes that while there is a proposed \$4 increase it is important to consider future increases. She looked back at her account information and in her time at WOU the fee has increased about \$50. Emily Searls notes that clubs were

told that if ASWOU was cut they would be directly affected. She notes that they may not have cut them as much if they had known it would affect the student body. Patrick Moser calls for as point of information ns ask if the impact on clubs was not part of the ASWOU cut package. Carter Craig clarifies that it was.

Carter Craig reminds the Committee that it is important to explain and provide reasoning for their decisions. They should remain consistent or provide a reasoning for moving away from the consistency. He also encourages Committee members to review cut packages when considering a cut so they are aware and can speak to the services rendered as opposed to the dollars saved.

c. Final decision

Abby's House – FY18 Request \$7,081 | Prelim \$7,081

Caleb Tingstad notes that several students spoke to their positive experience with Abby's House. He thinks it should be funded at its requested amount. Lindsey Marquardt appreciated that student spoke for Abby's House even though there were no preliminary cuts. Asia Cohen notes that it is an important resource to have on campus because it is a safe space. Emily Searls adds that while it is a small budget it makes a large impact on campus. Shelby Worthing thanks the department for having representatives at both open hearings. She adds that the request is a small amount of money but it impacts a large portion of campus. Caroline Basso notes that even though not everyone may use it Abby's House is a great resource to have on campus. Carter Craig states that the service more than justifies the cost. There is no dissent to funding at the FY18 request.

Access – FY18 Request \$24,583 | Prelim \$24,583

Lindsey Marquardt has similar thoughts in regards to Access as she did about Abby's House. It was nice to have a student speak to her involvement in the plays, a great way to execute equal opportunities. Shelby Worthing notes it is important to have Access because they are serving all students. She also likes that it is not a budget that will be spent doe unless there is a need present. Caleb Tingstad agrees with both Shelby and Lindsey. There is no dissent to funding at the FY18 request.

ASWOU – FY18 Request \$294,821 | Prelim \$265,339

Emily Searls notes that clubs and organizations are a big part of why students come to WOU, they find a place. She would like to see a smaller cut. It would be prudent to stay away from the 10% that would affect clubs. Caleb Tingstad notes that the slide on the 10% shows they could be cut \$20,000 without affecting clubs; would consider a \$20,000 decrease. Asia Cohen agrees that it needs to be reexamined and clubs should not be impacted. Caroline Basso is agreement. Lindsey Marquardt asks what the percentage would be on a \$20,000 cut. Caleb Tingstad responds that it would be 7%. Lindsey notes that they cannot ignore the student feedback. Looking at the student population as a whole, a lot of what ASWOU does goes unnoticed. There is a large population who do not know what

ASWOU is or does. Clubs are the most important part which justifies a 7%. Brian Tesch agrees with the 7% cut, his only remorse is that student pay will be affected. He adds that he was not given strong explanation of the budgets and feels that they could be leaned down a little. Caleb Tingstad echoes the ambiguity reference by Brian. The presentation was not very clear and posed many questions. Shelby Worthing notes that the \$3,600 in student pay would be the OrgSync programmer position and would not cause other payroll reductions. She is unaware of where the \$5,000 in administrative costs is coming from. She adds that if they are going with a 7% but then the 5% cuts will need to be larger than stated.

Carter Craig notes that the carryforward amount is substantial and has been consistent. He acknowledges that there may complex reasons but holds that a cut could be beneficial. Last year there was about \$13,000 but in the past it has been between \$13,000 and \$20,000.

Emily Searls is concerned that clubs may still be impacted with a 7% cut. Gary Dukes notes that they could recommend or suggest that ASWOU not cut clubs. Shelby Worthing adds that they had representatives at both open hearings who also heard the student feedback. Brain and Caleb are both in favor of a \$20,164 (7%) cut. Gary Dukes notes that based on what he heard from Senate it might be better to stick to a specific number as opposed to a percentage. Emily Searls notes that she would be more comfortable with a 5% cut. Caleb Tingstad notes that instead of dictating a percentage they would be sticking to the \$20,164 and strongly suggesting that clubs not be impacted. Carter Craig likes that number and notes that it would most likely affect internals. Shelby Worthing is leaning towards the 5% because many of her cut package questions have not been answered. Caleb Tingstad notes that the \$20,164 is more true to what was previously discussed.

Emily Searls reiterates her concern that a 7% cut could still impact the clubs. Asia Cohen is in agreement. Caleb Tingstad explains that even if they were to cut \$1 from the budget it could be assessed to clubs. They can make a recommendation but the final decision will be up to ASWOU. Cutting them 5% which does not include clubs does not mean they couldn't be cut anyway. Cynthia Olivares states that their main goal is to not cut clubs. If they receive a \$20,000 cut they would apply it to internals. However, if they are wanting to see more efficiency that rarely comes with less money. Caleb Tingstad asks if ASWOU had previously lied about their intention to cut clubs, it is listed on the slide but it is now being stated that they would not be affected. Patrick Moser points out that if the cuts are not prioritized it is not contradictory. Caleb Tingstad notes that he would say they are prioritized given the student feedback and Cynthia stating they would not cut clubs.

Carter Calls for a straw poll on the following:
\$20,164 (7%) reduction 4-4-0

\$14,741 (5%) reduction 4-4-0

Patrick Moser notes that they could work on a different number or take an official vote. Lindsey Marquardt notes that it would be hard to defend a third number. Shelby Worthing thinks the bigger cut would be too big of a hit to internals and could affect the services provided. Emily Searls agrees. Lindsey Marquardt could agree with that logic. She was in favor of a bigger cut because many people don't know about it but Shelby brought up a good point. Caleb Tingstad notes that it is a valid concern but if they did not believe there is nothing to indicate that they would not be able to function at their current level with a decrease. Carter Craig notes that while it was not said explicitly less money implies that there are less funds and less services.

Brian Tesch proposes a 6% with the reasoning that the Committee is evenly split, each half has defended their preference and this would be a middle ground. He would vote for a 6% over the 7%. Caroline and Asia both would prefer to stick with the 5%. Caleb Tingstad could be on board with the 6% because it reflects both sides. Brian Tesch agrees and reiterates that after defending their preference the Committee was evenly split. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll for the 6% cut, it passes 6-2-0.

Creative Arts – FY18 Request \$329,541 | Prelim \$322,891

Emily Searls, point of personal privilege at 1:28pm

Caleb Tingstad notes that the Committee did an extensive amount of research to back up their preliminary decision. There was concern at the open hearings about the concerts. He is specifically looking at Smith Fine Arts. With a cut there may be less projects, looking at the student hours in comparison to other things justifies the cut.

Shelby Worthing notes that the ASWOU Senate said the Committee could not cut an individual index. Gary Dukes confirms that is correct. The department could choose to move funds from other areas for the Smith Fine Arts if they wanted to. David Janoviak asks if Creative Arts will be free to choose which areas absorb the cut. Caleb Tingstad notes that while the Committee can give a strong suggestion as to where the cut should be made it will ultimately be up to the department.

Emily Searls returns at 1:31pm.

Brian Tesch asks David Janoviak where the cut to Creative Arts will be absorbed. David Janoviak responds that there would need to be a division discussion to decide that. Shelby Worthing notes that the cut packages are provided by index. Lindsey Marquardt notes that it is difficult to consider the impact of an overall cut when the cut packages provided are broken down by index. Shelby Worthing is appreciative of the students who showed up, they articulated well. She asks for

clarification on the \$6,000 cut. Patrick Moser notes that the \$6,000 was preliminarily cut from the Smith Fine Arts. David Janoviak asks if it is expected of a department to go with the strong recommendations from the Committee. Darin Silbernagel explain that the expectation is that the department would carry forwards with sentiment but would be able to make their own decision.

Brian Tesch notes that it comes down to students vs community. He still holds to that but will not lose sleep if the department rearranges the cut. Lindsey Marquardt notes that hearing from students at open hearings helps justify funding it. David Janoviak asks if she is less inclined to have the funds sprinkled after hearing the positive feedback. Lindsey Marquardt explains that she previously, before open hearings, saw no value in the Smith Fine Arts. Caleb Tingstad notes that he was looking at removing it (SFA) completely but after taking into account the student feedback there is justification for keeping the program but he stands by the cut.

Caroline Basso asks if the cut would mean decreasing the amount of shoes. Carter Craig explains that the Committee concluded that to be true. David Janoviak points out that if there is one show less the revenue form that show will also be lost. Carter Craig adds that performers are not a fixed cost. There are a lot of variables and it is important for the conversation to reflect that.

Carter Craig calls for a straw poll for funding at the preliminary decision. Straw poll passes 8-0-0.

Childcare – FY18 Request \$57,567 | Prelim \$57,567

There is a general consensus to fund at the preliminary decision. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision, it passes 8-0-0.

Athletics – FY18 Request \$1,303,715 | Prelim \$1,290,000

Caleb Tingstad was in favor of no cuts but was surprised by the open hearing feedback. It seemed that many students were ok with the cut and student athletes felt it was manageable. Gary Dukes points out that when talking about the athletic cut people are discussing percentage but keeping them at their FY17 allocation. He asks the Committee about their rationale since they have been looking at cut packages for other departments but not athletics.

Gary – from what I am hearing you are talking about a percentage but you're keeping them at their FY17. What is the rationale, you've been looking at cut packages but not on this one. Caleb Tingstad responds that Juan Navarro had Emily Searls had originally suggested the FY17 allocation. He asks Emily how she got to that suggestion. Emily Searls responded that she picked the FY17 allocation and stuck with it because if the department could fund the enhancements then they could manage with the FY17 allocation.

Shelby Worthing notes there was a lot of concern in regards to how the Committee was looking at this budget. The approach of considering the enhancements seems unfair. Gary Dukes points out that athletics provided cut packages, while they do not have monetary amounts listed, they could be looked at for consistency. He clarifies that he is not telling them to make cuts or not but rather just providing information.

Emily Searls chose the FY17 because that is a number she could see and the 5% cut seemed too large. Carter Craig notes that the preliminary decision number shows a convenient number and a poorly articulated desire not to cut too much. Caleb Tingstad feels that a good rationale is the desire not to increase the budget due to the student feedback as well as looking to balance the cost of the student fee. It is an acceptable number but rationale should be clarified. Carter Craig considers it a freeze of IFC's contribution to athletics. Caleb Tingstad agrees.

Brian Tesch agrees. He felt that athletics had a lot of areas with enhancements. Denying the enhancements is going to put pressure in the budget already. He believes the cut will be more meaningful due to the lack of enhancement. Lindsey Marquardt notes that she has a hard time understanding how the cut will impact the budget. With ASWOU they knew it would be the internals, and with Creative Arts they knew it would be the Smith Fine Arts. She asks for the reasoning for the cut to athletics.

Emily Searls responds that her rationale is that athletics has the ability to fundraise. Caleb Tingstad asks if there is an area that does not have the ability to fundraise. It is concluded that perhaps Access may not be able to fundraise. Carter Craig notes that Emily may have been referring to sponsorship opportunities. Lindsey Marquardt understands what is being said but notes that fundraising abilities were not considered when looking at other budgets. Carter Craig notes that it may be easy to accuse the Committee of making arbitrary decisions but rather they are not well articulated. He adds that students are shocked at how much money goes towards athletics and there is a desire to see a reduction within the budget. A freeze, give athletics room to reach goals but also demonstrates that we took student feedback into consideration. Other than ASWOU, athletics was the most talked about budget.

Lindsey Marquardt notes that she is having a hard time separating the enhancements from the budget because many of them are required, the money will have to come from somewhere. She is in favor of funding at the FY18 request with the assumption that they would not fund any enhancements. Carter Craig notes that he does not think it is in their process to vote on an amount with the understanding of something else.

Asia Cohen asks what a 6% cut would look like, since that is what they cut ASWOU. Patrick Moser notes that while he is an area head he also advises the

ASWOU Senate. He points out that the conversation that was just had was not one that was considered for other budgets and that is important to note. Gary Dukes notes that it will still come to rationale, it should not be based on what has been done to ASWOU. Brain Tesch notes they had a reason for the ASWOU cut. There is not a lot of information that is being and is very unsatisfied with the knowledge he has. He is not seeing the effects of the \$13,000 decrease on the sheets. Shelby Worthing notes that looking at the cuts was done for the other budgets that have received cuts. They have not really done that with the athletics budget and that is why there is not a lot of conversation happening.

Randy Lydum notes that with a 1% cut they are primarily looking at reducing the number of students traveling, traveling by ground vs. flight, student worker adjustments (some are student athletes others are not, and hosting home events. With a decrease in students workers staff members would need to pick up those responsibilities at events. Kind of agrees with the freeze because it gives them a starting point. Gary Dukes notes that in the 5% cut package they do not have dollar amounts associated with the items. Randy Lydum responds that there are variable costs depending on flights and such. Gary Dukes asks how much would be cut in each area if there were a 5% cut. Glen Harris responds that they do not have specific dollar amounts listed because they would go through each sport to determine where the cuts could be made. Gary Dukes asks about student game operations. Glen Harris responds that it does not have a specific dollar amount but is would be mostly payroll. Those are paid from a different fun but if the IFC allocation is decreased then they will need to dig into those funds. He will try to work out some numbers.

Shelby Worthing asks how many away games there are in comparison to the 86 home games. Glen Harris responds that there are significantly more away games. Shelby Worthing notes that looking at the 5% cuts she could see it dispersed amongst the budget. Carter Craig notes that the 5% cut package presents a series of variables that athletics will play with to reach the dollar amount needed. He is satisfied that the effects will not be too drastic but real.

Caleb Tingstad is in favor of the aforementioned freeze, funding at their FY17 allocation. Lindsey Marquardt is in favor because the cut package is too ambiguous. Carter Craig notes that all the cut packages are ambiguous because none of them are locked int. While some areas have been very specific with their dollar amounts they could still apply cuts to other areas. Shelby Worthing notes that she is not currently comfortable with the budget. It is a large budget and there is not enough information. Understands the freeze because it would cap the burden on students. She is leaning towards a 2.5% cut because she does not feel that there is enough information for a 5% cut.

Caleb Tingstad notes that they have been tasked with reviewing all the budgets in great deal and are now in the final decision. Making a decision based on lack of information is an error in their decision making. If there was a concern over lack

of information it should have been brought up much sooner. This is not a concern that was raised at preliminary decisions.

Brian Tesch notes that he understands that flights can be a variable cost. Shelby Worthing notes that she was not pleased with the discussion during preliminary decisions and voiced her opinion several times. She adds that it is important to consider the student feedback. Caleb Tingstad notes that with ASWOU and Creative Arts their lack of information was discussed from the beginning but that was never brought up about athletics until now.

Brian Tesch, point of personal privilege at 2:22pm.

Shelby Worthing asks to hear from other Committee members.

Emily Searls responds that she is on the fence. If athletics could find the \$23,000 needed for the enhancements then they did not need the \$13,000 increase. Asia Cohen would prefer the 2.5% cut because there is a lack of information. Being able to find the funds for the enhancements is worrisome. Caleb Tingstad questions why they would punish a department for their ability to fundraise. Shelby Worthing notes that she believes the wording was that they would find the funds in their budget.

Brian Tesch returns at 2:25pm

Randi Lydum notes that the comment was made by the Athletics Director, Barb Dearing, who is not present to speak to it. However, Randi believes she meant that other reductions would be made to fund some of the required enhancements. They do a lot of fundraising and are always seeking out inexpensive flights and lodging options.

Lindsey Marquardt notes that had the 2.5% cut been presented at open hearings they may have received different feedback. Carter Craig adds that a year to year freeze would be taken different than a decrease. Lindsey Marquardt proposes a 1.5% cut, something closer to the preliminary decision. Brian Tesch was on the fence about the preliminary decision and the 2.5% but feels like he could be in the Lindsey box (1.5%). He wanted to see a bigger cut because of the ambiguity. Asia Cohen also agrees with the 1.5%.

Carter Craig calls for a straw poll of the options:

Funding at the preliminary decision fails 1-7-0

2.5% cut fails 2-5-0

1.5% cut passes 7-1-0

Patrick Moser notes that while the process they used was fine it was not consistent with how they looked at ASWOU.

Caleb Tingstad disagrees. They reached a middle ground via discussion as opposed to voting but the process holds. They simply got there in a different manner that was still fully discussed. Carter Craig notes that ASWOU was different in the sense that the Committee was split and is concerned that the winning number may have lost validity because it was yielded from a split. Caleb Tingstad disagrees reiterates that he disagrees because they simply reached a middle ground via different route but everything was discussed.

Brian Tesch notes that on ASWOU nobody supported the middle number from the beginning, it was a reflection of the split. In terms of athletics the middle number was presented and it gathered support. Shelby Worthing agrees with Caleb and Brian. Caleb Tingstad adds that Patrick's point was that they did not follow the same guidelines which true bit the situations were different. In one instance they reached the middle ground via vote and in the other it was via discussion. Patrick Moser clarifies that when he interjects he is trying to help the Committee get through the ASWOU Senate.

Carter Craig calls for a straw poll on cutting athletics 1.5%, it passes 7-1-0.

Shelby Worthing moves to recess for 10 minutes. Asia Cohen seconds. Seeing no dissent Carter Craig ask the Committee to reconvene at 2:43pm

Extraordinary Travel – FY18 Request \$5,000 | Prelim \$5,000

Caleb Tingstad thinks they should fully fund extraordinary travel. Carter Craig states that it is important to note that club travel could be impacted due to ASWOU cuts. He calls for a straw poll to fully fund. It passes 8-0-0.

Student Media – FY18 Request \$92,136 | Prelim \$92,136

Shelby Worthing notes that student fees go directly to students with employment and positive impacts. Caleb Tingstad agrees. Lindsey Marquardt notes that it is important and benefits a lot of students. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision. It passes 8-0-0.

Campus Recreation Wellness Center FY18 Request \$ | Prelim \$

Caleb Tingstad is ok with preliminary decision and feels that there has been a lot of discussion. Carter Craig believes it is important to fund to that degree, it is a bright spot in the University's ability to recruit students. Additionally, it is very valuable to the student body's ability to build healthy habits. Emily Searls agrees.

Lindsey Marquardt notes that in looking at 5% cut package it is mostly the operation hours. All which would directly impact students.

Brian Tesch notes that when looking at universities, his dad had forgotten about WOU until he reminded him it was that one with the rock wall. It is a bit of a gem that gets shown off to students. Very important and widely used facility on

campus and he would be in support of the preliminary decision. Shelby Worthing adds that during campus tours the save the HWC until the end, people want to see it. Lindsey Marquardt notes that no one spoke to it at open hearings. Shelby Worthing adds that Rip Horsey had told the Committee that students tend to expect buildings to always be open.

Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision. The straw poll passes 8-0-0.

Campus Recreation Club Sports – FY18 Request \$49,043 | Prelim \$49,043

Caleb Tingstad notes that club sports make the university great and provide diversity. The students who spoke at open hearings were appreciative of their funding. Lindsey Marquardt adds that student pay out of their pocket to participate. Asia Cohen notes that while talking to students around campus, club sports was something that stood out. Shelby Worthing notes that it was a nice opportunity for students to partake in sports not offered by WOU and reiterates that they cover out of pocket expenses.

Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision. Straw poll passes 8-0-0.

Campus Recreation Intramurals – FY18 Request \$40,505 | Prelim \$40,505

Caleb Tingstad explains that he is involved in intramurals and they are well structured. He would be in favor of funding at the preliminary decision. Carter Craig did not hear much at open hearings but the participation numbers (provided by Rip) speak for themselves. He calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision. It passes 8-0-0.

Student Engagement Operations – FY18 Request \$1,296,098 | Prelim \$1,283,137

Carter Craig asks the Committee how they got to the decision. Lindsey Marquardt notes that they went off of the cut package list; numbers 1-6. There was a lot of discussion in regards to the cut impacts and furniture cleaning. Caleb Tingstad notes that the cut packages provided by student engagement should be the standard. While he understands that the Committee cannot line item, the list was very informative in trying to assess cuts. He is in favor of the preliminary decision. Shelby agrees with Caleb about the cut packages. While the Committee can figure out the cute percentages the list is helpful. Carter Craig notes that during tabeling there was a lot of shrugging in response to what would be cut, it was hard to visualize. It is important to be mindful of the effects, especially over the long term. Lindsey Marquardt assures Carter that the Committee had a thorough discussion that included cleaning cycles. Shelby Worthing notes that she still has the same concern around the cleaning cycle. Emily Searls agrees, if the furniture is maintained regularly it will last longer.

Carter Craig asks about the rationale for making the cut. Shelby Worthing notes there was concern expressed at the open hearings. Carter Craig notes that the budget cut is unnecessary and there is no indication that the students asked for it. Emily Searls adds that the services are widely used by student. They offer a lot and she does not see a reason for the cut. Asia Cohen agrees. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll for the preliminary decision. It fails 3-4-1.

Caleb Tingstad asks why Committee members have moved away from the preliminary decision. Emily Searls responds that she was never in favor of it. Lindsey Marquardt explains that she had proposed cutting only 1-4 from the list in the cut package. Carter Craig asks the Committee if they would like to discuss that proposal. Lindsey Marquardt explains that she suggested items 1-4 only to avoid impacting cleaning schedules. Emily Searls notes that items 1-4 would equal a \$5,950 cut, Darin Silbernagel asks to have the administrative overhead included, making it a total cut of \$6,391. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll on the \$6,391 cut (items 1-4). Seeing hesitation he encourages more discussion.

Asia Cohen is on the fence. Shelby Worthing is not in favor. The Committee talked about their cut packages being the gold standard but it feels like they are being penalized for it as well. She notes that she would not go past number 4 on the list. She does not want to impact the AV equipment that is used to turn conference rooms to smart rooms; it helps bring in other organization.

Carter Craig calls for a straw poll on a \$6,391 cut, it pass 6-1-1.

Leadership, Inclusion, Activities FY118 Request \$59,992 | Prelim \$59,992

Caleb Tingstad would be ok with the preliminary decision because the budget goes directly to students. Its purpose is to increase the quality of student life at WOU. Emily Searls agrees with Caleb. Lindsey Marquardt notes that looking at the services on the slideshow it is clear that different groups are being reached. Dollars going back to students and she would be in support of funding the preliminary decision. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision, it passes 8-0-0.

Student Activities Board FY18 Request \$59,950 | Prelim \$59,950

Brian Tesch note the he would like to stick with the preliminary decision thinks it was well discussed. There are several events/activities provided for students. Caleb Tingstad agrees. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision, it passes 8-0-0.

WOLF Ride FY18 Request \$30,414 | Prelim \$30,414

Caleb Tingstad thinks they should fund at the preliminary decision because it is an awesome service. Shelby Worthing spoke to some students who had further questions about the program. Lindsey Marquardt notes that some did not know they were funding it but then were ok because of what is provided. Asia Cohen adds that international students are in favor of the service because many do not

have any other form of transportation. Emily Searls notes that it is also beneficial due to the special rises for out of state students. Shelby Worthing notes that is good for clubs as well.

Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision, it passes 8-0-0.

Service Learning & Career Development FY18 Request \$7,645 | Prelim \$7,645

Shelby Worthing thinks they should fund it at the preliminary decision. Caleb Tingstad agrees. Carter Craig notes that during tableing it was apparent that students were utilizing WOLF Link, a valuable tool. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision, it passes 8-0-0.

Computer Replacement Reserve FY18 Request \$30,500 | Prelim \$30,500

Caleb Tingstad is in favor of funding at the preliminary decision. It was decided upon for good reason in the past and should continue. Emily Searls is in agreement because she sees the value in having working computers available. Gary Dukes wonders where they are in the replacement process. Daring Silbernagel and Brandon Neish respond the UCS is just about done with the 2010 tags and will be starting on the 2011 tags soon. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision, it passes 8-0-0.

Enhancements

Carter Craig informs the Committee that they will be going down the full list of enhancements, if 3 or more members want to discuss it they will. After going down the list they discuss the following enhancements:

Student Veterans of America FY18 Request \$2,386 | Prelim \$2,386

Brian Tesch notes that they are a brand new club that has reached the time that they can request funds. He heard about the dinner they hosted last year and it seemed like it was well attended. He is in support of funding the preliminary decision. Shelby Worthing noted that she was surprised that club members had attend multiple IFC meetings as well as both open hearings. She adds that she was satisfied with the answers provided in previous occasions. Lindsey Marquardt found it impressive that they were able to put on an event without being funded. Carter Craig notes there were a lot of questions at the preliminary decision meeting and the club members fielded them all well. He calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision, it passes 8-0-0.

Convert position to Assistant Director FY18 Request \$46,397 | Prelim \$0

Shelby Worthing notes that they did not originally consider the multiple options presented. Lindsey Marquardt agrees. She would like people to speak to any options that they are drawn to funding. Patrick Moser clarifies that the process previously used for base budgets may not be an equivalent because, for enhancements, one option is also to not fund.

Shelby Worthing is leaning towards funding one of the options, everyone has had something positive to say about Campus Recreation. She does not think they can do much more without the position. Emily Searls is in agreement. She was previously on the fence. She acknowledged that it is a lot of money but thinks they need a chance to show what they can do.

Caleb Tingstad does not think the position should be funded at any level. It is a difficult one because the majority of the people who want to use the facilities will do so regardless. He question whether there will be any increase in the usage. The current staff function at a very high level already and this would be a big burden for students to incur for many years to come. Brain Tesch is on the fence. For him it is not a question of the attendance being at 80% but rather how often those students are actually using the facilities and what activities/events are bringing them back. Sees benefits but is hesitant about the monetary component.

Lindsey Marquardt notes that while many students are using the facilities they may not necessarily be involved in everything. She would even be in support, even if it was the smallest package because there is still a lot of room to grow. Shelby Worthing agrees and notes that it may not increase the percentage but it may increase the value. Emily Searls adds that the department is very passionate, it is a gem on campus, and is an area that directly affects students. Lindsey Marquardt notes that they are performing at a high level now but over time they might get burned out from being stretched to thin.

Caleb Tingstad notes that he tries to thinking highly of people as much as he can but the fear that they might get burnout is not a good reason to fund. He does not see why someone would get burnout from a job they are paid to do. Rip Horsey notes that they have been open for 6 years and they are on their fourth person in the half-time position. The center has had a lot of growth in the past years but not in their staff. He appreciates the compliment in regards to their efficiency. However, they have also reached a point where they cannot take on any more projects or offer more services because they do not have the staffing capabilities.

Shelby Worthing notes that turnover is costly in of itself due to the hiring and training time. Normally when a budget it not being utilized correctly a cut is assessed, this is the opposite.

Carter Craig asks the Committee if they would like to go through the options, starting with the least costly, and see where they are at. There is no dissent. He calls for a straw poll of the accounting technician, it passes 7-1-0. Once the Committee has looked over the business manager position Carter calls for a straw poll, it passes 5-3-0.

Rip Horsey informs the Committee that he would rather them not move on to the assistant director. While that would be the dream position he feels that the

business manager gives them everything they need to move forward and show what they can accomplish.

Carter Craig releases the Chair responsibilities to Caleb Tingstad at 4:10pm.

Women's Rugby travel increase FY18 Request \$1,032 | Prelim \$1,032

Asia Cohen is in favor of the preliminary decision. Emily Searls is in agreement. She feels that the Committee had great discussion and it is a safety concern. Shelby Worthing stands by safety and equality and is in favor of funding at the preliminary decision.

Caleb Tingstad notes that he is still opposed to funding the request. Sees it as more of a luxury than a necessity and the safety concern is unfounded. He calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision, it passes 6-1-0.

Caleb Tingstad releases the Chair responsibilities to Carter Craig at 4:12pm

Men's Soccer travel increase FY18 Request \$430 | Prelim \$430

Caleb Tingstad does not agree with funding the request as he sees it as more of a luxury request. Shelby Worthing notes that she is unsure because the team would not always be facing a late return. Rip Horsey notes that while they may not always be looking at a late return there are sometimes very early departures that carry the same safety concerns. One difference between club sports and athletics is shown in the lodging. Athletics has stated that athletes sleep one per bed, club sports double up and try to save wherever they can. Club sports participants pay to participate and they never request food allocations. They do their best to cut down on costs and the request is to ensure their athlete get to and from their competitions safely. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision, it passes 6-2-0.

Additional Outdoor trip per year FY18 request \$1,037 | Prelim \$0

Brian Tesch asks what the student labor for outdoor trips covers. Rip Horsey responds that the trips at 8hr days and there are two trip leaders. Caleb Tingstad asks about the number of students in attendance in the past. Rip Horsey responds that the information is in the stats handout but it has steadily increased. He adds that they had an additional trips in the previous year due to a grant. Lindsey Marquardt states that she is not necessarily in support of the request, considers it a luxury that could maybe be considered in a different year. Caleb Tingstad agrees with Lindsey. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund the request, it fails 0-8-0.

OrgSync API FY18 Request \$2,148 | Prelim \$2,148

Caleb Tingstad believes the Committee has discussed it extensively. It has increased the speed for communication and will reach all students; streamlining the process. Carter Craig is in favor of funding it. He notes that some students may not know much about OrgSync or use it frequently but it is also fairly new software that needs to go through a cycle. Shelby Worthing agrees. Lindsey Marquardt also thinks it is a good idea to give it a chance. Gary Dukes asks how

long the contract is. Patrick Moser responds that it is a 3 year contract and they are in their first year of the renewal. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision, it passes 8-0-0.

Brandon Neish notes that given all those decisions the fee would \$341 with an \$8 increase; \$5 in base budgets and \$3 in enhancements. There is approximately \$8,000 in wiggle room.

Summer 2018

Creative Arts Summer 18' Request \$34,225 | Prelim \$34,225

Carter Craig notes that the theatre program has had great success and it does not make sense to pull the plug on that. Shelby Worthing is in agreement. She adds that she once attended an outside play simply because she saw it happening. Caleb Tingstad asks if there was any summer specific feedback. While there was not much there was an instance of a student taking one summer course and having to pay the full fee. Asia Cohen notes that some students she spoke with were upset about having to pay the summer fee for taking online courses. Darin Silbernagel notes that students taking only online classes would not be paying the fee, however if they had some on campus classes as well they would be paying the fee.

Caleb Tingstad, point of personal privilege at 4:37pm.

Carter Calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision, it passes 7-0-1.

Childcare Summer 18' Request \$8,666 | Prelim \$8,666

There is general support for fully funding. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund the preliminary decision, it passes 7-0-1.

Campus Recreation Summer 18' Request \$63,655 | Prelim \$63,655

Emily Searls is in favor of funding because they scrape by with what they have. Asia Cohen agrees. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision, it passes 7-0-1.

Student Engagement Operations Summer 18' Request \$24,240 | Prelim \$24,240

Carter Craig notes that the allocation does not cover the full cost of the building. Lindsey Marquardt adds that looking over the budget there is no room for cuts since all the expenses are operational. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision, it passes 7-0-1.

Leadership, Inclusive, Activities Summer 18' Request \$4,028 | Prelim \$4,028

Lindsey Marquardt notes that there is not a lot to do over the summer and sees this budget as a benefit to the summer students. Shelby Worthing adds that prospective students notice the heatwave concerts during summer tours. She believes it to be a good use of the funds and the little kids like it too. Carter Craig

think it's fun that the cuts revolve around having a slip n slide or no slip n slide. He is definitely pro slip n slide, he also likes that it is something a whole family could enjoy.

Caleb Tingstad returns at 4:45pm.

Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fund at the preliminary decision, it passes 7-0-1.

Campus Recreation Enhancement Summer 18' Request \$2,835 | Prelim \$2,835

Brandon Neish explains that the HWC runs into deficit annually that is then picked up by the academic year allocation. The Committee is in agreement. Carter Craig calls for a straw poll to fully fund, it passes 8-0-0.

Caleb Tingstad moves to approve the budgets as follows:

Abby's House - \$7,081

Access - \$24,583

ASWOU - \$277,583

Creative Arts - \$322,891

Athletics - \$1,284,159

Childcare - \$57,567

Extraordinary Travel - \$5,000

Student Media - \$92,136

Campus Recreation - Wellness Center - \$942,202

Campus Recreation - Club Sports - \$49,043

Campus Recreation - Intramurals - \$40,505

Student Engagement Operations - \$1,289,707

Student Engagement - Leadership, Inclusion, & Activities - \$59,992

Student Engagement - Student Activities Board - \$59,950

WOLF Ride - \$30,414

Service Learning & Career Development - \$7,645

Computer Replacement Reserve - \$30,500

For a total of \$4,449,717 (including rollover) with a \$5 increase to the fee.

Enhancements

ASWOU - \$2,386 for Student Veterans of America

Campus Recreation - \$40,736 for s business manager and travel increases to Women's Rugby and Men's Soccer.

Student Engagement - \$2,148 for OrgSync API

A total of \$43,122 in enhancements, adding \$3 to the fee.

This sets the fee at \$341 with a total increase of \$8.

Summer

Creative Arts - \$34,225

Childcare - \$8,666
Campus Recreation – Wellness Center - \$63,655
Student Engagement Operations - \$24,240
Student Engagement – Leadership, Inclusion, & Activities - \$4,028

For a total of \$134,814 and a \$17 increase to the summer fee

Campus Recreation enhancement - \$2,835
Increasing the fee by an additional \$3 setting the summer fee at \$153 with a \$20 increase

Lindsey Marquardt seconds the motions.

Discussion:

Carter Craig thinks they were pretty thoughtful about the process and discussion. Caleb Tingstad notes that one of the issues with last year was general consensus. He appreciated that they took the time to go through individual budgets. Brian Tesch believes they took individual stances per budget and is comfortable that he stated his opinions along the way. Shelby Worthing reiterates that cut packages should be detailed going forth. Lindsey Marquardt notes that she is comfortable with the decisions because they explained their rationale and they tried to stay somewhat true to the preliminary decision.

The motion passes 8-0-0.

7. Subcommittee Report

Caleb Tingstad informs the Committee that his Subcommittee met and decided to award funds to the WOU Psychology club for some upcoming conference travel.

8. Announcements

Carter Craig informs the Committee that he will be going to the ASWOU Senate meeting on Monday but can only be there from 6:00pm – 7:00pm. He asks who else can attend. Shelby Worthing has class from 5:00-7:00pm. Brian Tesch can be there at 6pm. Lindsey Marquardt can attend. Asia Cohen can attend after 8pm if they are still meeting.

Lindsey Marquardt announces that there will be trivia in the Willamette room at 7pm with free food and prizes.

It is announced that Moana will be shown in the swimming pool on Saturday.

9. Adjournment

Caleb Tingstad moves to adjourn the meeting. Lindsey Marquardt seconds the motion. No discussion. The motion passes 8-0-0, the meeting adjourns at 5:07pm.

