

Incidental Fee Committee  
Minutes

Meeting #8  
February 17, 2017 12pm  
Pacific Room, Werner University Center

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting is called to order at 12:02pm by Caleb Tingstad, Vice Chair.

**2. Roll Call**

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

**IFC Chair:** Carter Craig

**Advisors:** Darin Silbernagel, Director of Business Services; and Gary Dukes, Vice President for Student Affairs.

**Area Heads:** Debbie Diehm, Wolf Ride; Rhys Finch, Student Media; Rip Horsey, Campus Recreation; and Leo Mejia Aguilar, ASWOU; David Janowiak, Creative Arts; Malissa Larson, Access; Aislinn Addington, Abby's House and Patrick Moser, Student Engagement.

**Other Representatives:** Brandon Neish, Budget Office; Glen Harris, Athletics; Cynthia Olivares, ASWOU President; Jeanie Stuntzner, Creative Arts; Randi Lydum, Athletics; Zach Hammer, Oregon Student Association; Yasmin Ibarra, Oregon Student Association; Cristian Urzua, ASWOU State & Federal Affairs; Rubi Tapia, ASWOU Senate; Ami Diaz, ASWOU Multicultural Advocacy; Alex Quintana, ASWOU Director of Public Relations; Sarah Tabor, ASWOU Director of Internal Affairs; Sam Dunaway, ASWOU Vice President; Desi Root, ASWOU Director of Equity; Andrew Holbert, Advisor; and Shane Follett WOU Student Veterans of America President.

**IFC Secretary:** Adela Aguilar

**Not Present:** Barb Dearing, Athletics; Eric Yahnke, Vice President Finance & Administration; Adry Clark, Service Learning & Career Development; and Carey Gilbert, Childcare.

**3. Approval of Minutes**

**a. February 10, 2017**

Asia Cohen moves to approve the minutes from February 10, 2017. Emily Searls seconds. The motion passes 7-0-0.

Due to technical difficulties the Vice Chair calls for a recess at 12:07pm.

**4. Approval of the Agenda**

The meeting is called back to order at 12:13pm by Caleb Tingstad, Vice Chair. Emily Searls moves to approve the agenda. Lindsey Marquardt seconds. No discussion. Motion passes 7-0-0.

## 5. Old Business

### a. Open Hearings – Breakout sessions

Caleb Tingstad explains that the Committee will breakout in pairs with groups of student to get feedback. The following questions were used to drive discussion in the previous year:

1. How do you feel about the overall fee?
2. What do you feel the strongest about in the budgets?
3. Do you think you benefit enough from the services provided by the fee? How?
4. What so you think could be improved in the budget? What do you disagree with?

Shelby Worthing asks if the questions will be available elsewhere for those not able to attend open hearings. Caleb Tingstad notes that they could set something up. Gary Dukes reminds the Committee that they should be tabling with Senators and that would also be a good place for that. Patrick Moser notes that it could be sent out through OrgSync if an IFC member collaborates with the Student Engagement office, it can be set so that students can only answer the questions once. Shelby Worthing volunteers to coordinate with Student Engagement. Committee members are in favor of using the same questions.

### b. Enhancements – Brandon Neish

Brandon Neish notes that as he was going through the preliminary decision it became apparent that ASWOU did not submit their enhancements to him or the Google Drive. He asks the Committee if he should proceed with the requests even though they were, technically, late. Gary Dukes notes that both enhancements were part of the ASWOU budget presentation and does not feel that the clubs should be faulted. There is a general consensus to review the enhancements.

### c. ASWOU

Cynthia Olivares would like to address the concerns raised by the IFC because a 10% would be detrimental. Clubs and orgs are a big part of why students participate on campus and are retained.

Highlight accomplishments:

- Equal rights director: WOU diversity tour – campus tour that highlights services for marginalized groups on campus. Worked with Senate to update ASWOU bylaws to increase inclusion in documents - Worked on Vote-OR-Vote campaign

- Student orgs: Worked on the student org fair – handles training for clubs and works on rechartering – attends club meetings (improving communication is cornerstone for ASWOU this year)
- Public relations: helps with advertising club events and ASWOU functions on campus
- State & Federal Affairs: Works on Vote-OR-Vote campaign – delivers

Caleb Tingstad does not believe the meeting is appropriate time or place for the response to the proposed ASWOU cuts and suggests speaking to the cuts at open hearings.

#### **d. Preliminary Decision**

##### **Campus Recreation – Health & Wellness Center – 942,202 request**

Lindsey Marquardt is in favor of fully funding at the FY18 request because it is open to all the students.

Caleb Tingstad also agrees that the center is frequently used. He also notes that not a lot of universities, of similar size, can offer such a center. Emily Searls agrees and adds that they provide a lot of programs for students. Caleb Tingstad encourages everyone to speak up. Asia is in agreement with fully funding. Caroline Basso explains that the Health & Wellness Center was one of the things that drew her to WOU. Brian Tesch and Shelby Worthing are also in support of fully funding.

##### **Student Engagement operations – 1,296,098 request**

Shelby Worthing reviewed their 5% cut package and would not be in favor of reducing the budget. The WUC operating hours would be cut drastically; this could impact a student's ability to use the building on weekends/evening. She is also opposed to a negative impact on student wages, especially in the Stonewall Center and Non-Traditional Student Lounge.

Caleb Tingstad is in favor of a 1% cut because he believes there are times when the building is not being fully utilized. He notes that the effects of the decrease would be small but it would be a relief on the students. Lindsey Marquardt asks how much a 1\$ cut would be. Brandon Neish responds that it would be \$12,961. Patrick Moser notes that a 1% would mean eliminating items 1-6 on their cut package.

Caleb Tingstad asks if the computer replacement is built into the budget. Patrick Moser responds that they have prioritized some funds for equipment replacement because they have need the IFC computer replacement will not meet. Brandon Neish explains that the IFC computer reserve is specifically for desktops and laptops. Lindsey Marquardt notes that she would be in favor of a 1% decrease is the Leadership, Inclusion & Activities budget was not reduced because programming is more visible to students than 1-6 of the 5% cut package. Caleb Tingstad agrees.

Shelby Worthing asks how often the furniture is replaced. Patrick Moser explains there is a constant need for furniture replacements which is why there is an allocation in account code 20200 for it. Two years ago they replaced conference room chairs thanks to an enhancement. He adds that furniture is currently cleaned once per year but that would need to be altered if they receive a decrease.

Brian Tesch asks Patrick to speak about #7 on the cut package (Reduce Specialized Equipment purchasing). Patrick Moser explains that it involves maintaining the pool table, some round tables (used for banquets), outdoor umbrellas/tables, doodle scrubber, and outside building mats. He adds that it may not seem like exciting stuff but it is necessary to maintain the building. Brian Tesch is in favor of a cut, not sure if he would like it to go all the way to 7 but he would be in favor of cutting 1-6. Caleb Tingstad notes that is hearing two proposals; fully fund the FY18 request or a 1% cut and asks members to speak their thoughts.

Shelby Worthing thanks Patrick for providing detailed cut packages. Asia would feel comfortable cutting items 1-4 but not 5-6 since those have more to do with sanitation. Caroline Basso is in agreement. Brian Tesch reminds the Committee that they cannot specify what is cut and what is not, if an item is important to the department they will make the necessary adjustment. Caleb Tingstad notes he is still in favor of a 1% reductions. Patrick Moser clarifies that they spot clean the furniture throughout the year. The once per year cleaning is a deep clean that is contracted out. Emily Searls asks if deep cleaning the furniture make is last longer. Patrick Moser confirms it saves money in the long run to maintain furniture. Lindsey Marquardt is in favor of the 1% decrease. Emily Searls thinks a 1% decrease could be good but also notes that with the deep cleaning the furniture could last longer. Caleb Tingstad asks who is in favor of 1% decrease, the majority agree.

Caleb Tingstad asks if the Committee would like to discuss the Student Engagement Leadership, Inclusion, & Activities (LIA) budget. Lindsey

Marquardt notes she was in favor of cutting Student Engagement Operations to avoid cutting the LIA budget. Asia Cohen agrees with fully funding the LIA budget because it has value. Shelby Worthing notes that they marked that budget for further consideration at the end of the budgeting process.

### **Creative Arts - 329,541 request**

Caleb Tingstad notes that the Committee should consider a cut that would encompass the Smith Fine Arts. He's been reviewing the detailed spreadsheet. It is his understanding the Smith Fine Arts Series had been funded by the University. However, the University determined that the Series could be self-sustaining and cut it. At that point Keller Coker asked the IFC to have students take it on. He would like to cut it from the budget because he does not think students feel the full effect of the \$51,260. Looking at last year there were 6 events and approximately 56 student tickets sold for the Smith Fine Arts Series. David Janoviak clarifies that while there were 56 student tickets sold there were 296 free tickets for WOU students that year and, so far, there are 225 this year. There have also been 53 student tickets sold at \$11, making it a total of 278 student tickets, so far, for the year. Caleb Tingstad asks the capacity of Rice Auditorium. David Janoviak responds that the Rice Auditorium holds 600.

Shelby Worthing asks if the Smith Fine Arts (SFA) staff have other roles on campus or if their sole role is SFM? David Janoviak explains that the current Executive Director, Keller Coker, is a faculty member but that may not always be the case. His SFA salary is about \$6,000 and it is strictly for him to negotiate and book the performers. He also seeks out grants and other fundraising opportunities. While that position is currently held by a faculty member there is no guarantee that will always be the case. The Assistant is there to help the executive director and is currently held by Sandy Newland and that is her only position at WOU.

David Janoviak notes that students put in over 600 hours of preparation to be able to work with and perform with the national and international acts that make up the Smith Fine Arts Series. While students do not perform in each event, the performers are usually on campus a couple days and work with the students then. Caleb Tingstad asks what would happen if the SFA was no longer funded. Davin Janoviak responds that he asked Keller Coker that very question and he does not think it could continue without the IFC funding.

Caroline Basso notes that she would not like to see the budget cut because it brings in a lot of people and it is a great opportunity for the community to come together. She adds that the concerts give students

an opportunity to get credit for attendance and not having them would make it difficult for some students. Emily Searls is not in favor of cutting the whole budget but would consider a cut. Brian Tesch asks if all students have to purchase tickets. Davin Janoviak explains that they put aside a number of tickets for WOU students. Darin Silbernagel adds that students are able to get tickets the night of the show.

Shelby Worthing asks for clarification in regards to choosing indices to cut. Caleb Tingstad explains that choosing to cut a particular index is not the same as line-iteming because it is a sub-department. Shelby Worthing explains that her question stemmed from it being previously brought up in regards to ASWOU. Brian Tesch notes that in the past there had been \$5,000 budgeted in grants and asks if it has been sought out/received this year. David Janoviak explains that they apply for grants annually but there is not guarantee that they will also be received.

Caleb Tingstad notes that he does not think any other part of the Creative Arts budget should be cut but he would be in favor of the cutting SFA. Lindsey Marquardt notes that perhaps the department could discuss having less events. As a student she's not sure that she would be as interested in attending the events if she had to get her ticket the night of. Emily Searls adds that she would like to see better data on how many students actually attend the series. David Janoviak notes that he has recently received some data and has Brandon put it up on the screen. Lindsey Marquardt is looking over the detailed budget provided for SFA and asks for further explanation of line 37 (Transfer from Foundation to University Index and Foundation Endowment). Darin Silbernagel notes that they transfer a certain number of fundraised dollars as needed. There appears to be \$30,000 that rolled and \$20,000 of it is being held in case the programs come in under the expected amount.

Shelby Worthing notes that she remembers when theatre tickets were free for students and asks how much it would cost to make that happen again. David Janoviak responds that it would require about \$18,000. There are musical and non-musical years, it would be ideal to have the funding for two years in order to obtain solid data for both. Lindsey Marquardt asks if IFC is supplementing what the Foundation was maybe covering. Darin Silbernagel clarifies that IFC only pays for salary costs for SFA. If SMFA was not funded through IFC it would be up to the department to figure out if they could cut some events or if they would have to do away with the program. The Committee needs to decide the value of getting free tickets. David Janoviak notes that the SFA really marries the community, student,

and campus life. It brings a lot of diversity and there is a lot of value in that.

Emily Searls notes that if there needs to be a cut she would not want to be without tickets. She asks about the impact of reducing the number of events. David Janoviak points out the IFC funds the positions and not the programming associated with SFA. Shelby Worthing asks if there is data available of the time when tickets were free. David Janoviak explains that he has sent out all the data available to him. They are unable to distinguish free tickets from purchased tickets/students from general population. He adds that there is huge student involvement when it comes to choosing the productions. Gary Dukes notes that there should be card sliders available at the box office to produce better number. David Janoviak explains that it is all very new to him and that he will certainly address it with the Creative Arts division. He adds that Summer Shakespeare does not even require tickets since it is held outside. Jeanie Stuntzner reiterates that they are working on obtaining better data. Gary Dukes understands that they are new but explains that the data request is not a new one which is frustrating. Brian Tesch asks about ticket prices. Darin Silbernagel notes that online prices for SFA are listed as \$25 in advance, \$28 at the door, and \$10 for students.

Brian Tesch notes that it seems that 1/3 is funded by students but he is not seeing 1/3 attendance by students. He then proposes an 11% cut to SFA which would reflect a 15% increase to ticket costs for the community. He would like to see it funded a bit more through the community.

Juan Navarro arrives at 1:42pm.

The Committee agrees that students should be prioritized for tickets. Lindsey Marquardt agrees but also notes that perhaps it should be limited since community members are paying higher prices. She hopes better data is available in the future. Shelby Worthing is in favor of an overall cut, leaving it up to the discretion of the department as to where the cuts should be made. Caleb Tingstad does not think Creative Arts as a whole should be cut. There is a lack of data but he understands the staff is fairly new. David Janoviak agrees that the data provided needs to be better in the future. He reiterates that students have put in about 600 hours preparing for SFA events.

Caleb Tingstad notes that SFA is about \$50,000 and Creative Arts as a whole is about \$300,000. He is still in favor of cutting SFA based on the minimal impact it has on students in comparison to overall Creative Arts. Caleb Tingstad, Caroline Basso, and Emily Searls are ok

with an 11% cut. Shelby Worthing notes that she would have liked to look at the full budget and then sub budgets. She is concerned with potential academic restrictions. She is not a fan of completely cutting SFA because students have the opportunity to learn and perform with the artists that come to WOU. There is general agreement to cut the SFA by 11%.

Caleb Tingstad notes that looking at the overall budget he would not be in favor of additional cuts due to the impact it would have on students. Asia Cohen agrees with Caleb Tingstad. Shelby Worthing agrees but notes that she would like to see data on how the department affects the whole WOU community. As a student she would like to see it allocated more towards students. She asks if there are any academics associated with the IFC funds. She notes that it was mentioned earlier that BFA students are required to put on a show. David Janoviak explains that they are very inclusive and do not always cast the best to do the show and they do not necessarily cast based on majors either. However, they try to ensure that productions are big enough that those required to partake have an opportunity to do so.

Lindsey Marquardt notes she would have liked seeing the cut packages presented in a similar fashion to those for Student Engagement. Caleb Tingstad reiterates that future Committee's would appreciate better data and they would like to ensure that students are the priority for free events. The majority of the Committee is in favor of cutting 11% from SFA and fully funding the remainder of the overall Creative Arts request.

#### **Athletics - 1,303,715 request**

Caleb Tingstad is in favor of funding the FY18 request. He adds that Carter was also in favor of fully funding. He understands that 1.3 million is a lot of money and it might seem easy to knock off 1% but would caution the Committee because there is a direct correlation between the funding and the ability to succeed. He goes to explain that Humboldt State University, similar to WOU, had been running on a deficit so they hired an outside accounting firm to help them out. The firm outlined in their report that the athletics department was like the University's front porch. While he acknowledged that may not be true for all students he does not think the department should be cut because it is like a platform for the University. Brain Tesch notes that if there needs to be a cut he would like it not to impact travel. Lindsey Marquardt notes that during the presentation the department noted they would find a way to supplement their enhancements. Shelby Worthing notes that when looking through cut packages she wants to see the impact on students on campus. In regards to the front porch theory, she thinks WOU is better known for the College of Education



and the American Sign Language program. It is important to look at the budgets objectively and note the number of unique student participants.

Shelby Worthing notes there are 96 home events this year and asks how many there were last year. Glen Harris responds that there were about 94. Asia Cohen notes that when they think of WOU they do not necessarily think about athletics. The number of students not involved in comparison to those involved don't show a big impact on student life.

Carter Craig arrives at 2:20pm.

Juan Navarro adds that people come to WOU for educational programs. Caleb Tingstad notes that he is part of the athletics and he is consistently surrounded by members of a variety of backgrounds. Just because someone does not necessarily see the effect of the department does not mean it is not there. He adds that there are great opportunities within athletics to WOU out there. Brian Tesch proposes to leave the budget as is and potentially revisiting it for a 1% cut after assessing the fee. Lindsey Marquardt likes the idea and notes they could then move on to enhancements. She adds that WOU would be different without athletics but the same could be said of the other departments. She could be ok with fully funding and not awarding any enhancements. Caroline Basso is in agreement. Brandon Neish reminds the Committee that all budgets need to be treated fairly. If the Committee is going to take the stand of not allowing an area to speak to the decisions being made about their budget but then allowing another budget to do so they are creating a disparity between them.

Emily Searls notes that it was stated, during the presentation that if enhancements were not awarded the department would find the funds elsewhere. Glen Harris responds that they do have other funding sources and do as much fundraising as possible. As for the enhancements, they would take it item by item and do what they can to fund what they can. He adds that they listed their enhancements because they are needed but if they are not awarded they will seek funding and may not get to all of them this year. Shelby Worthing notes that it is important to take into account the effect on all the students and not just those participating in any particular area. She understands that athletics is a big part of the University culture but it has a big price tag.

Caleb Tingstad notes that several people have agreed there should not be cuts but maybe an asterisk to review later. He believes it is almost discriminatory in regards to the budget if there is no reasoning other

than potentially saving a dollar off the fee. If that is the way the athletics budget is going to be looked at then all the budgets should be looked at in the same fashion. Shelby Worthing notes that athletics is a very large budget and they've only spent a fraction of the time on it that other budgets. In looking at the 68 student workers in the cut package she asks if the department would cut all the student positions. Glen Harris notes that not all student workers are hired at the same time, they are only employed for the season and there are backup employees. They also employ student athletes. The number 68 is representative of how many employees they may have in a whole year. Currently, they have two students per event, one sells the tickets and the other check them. A cut might mean eliminating one of the students and utilizing staff time instead. Lindsey Marquardt suggests looking at the budget in conjunction with the enhancements, she would not want to make a cut and then potentially award more in enhancements.

Brian Tesch notes that he does not want to make a cut but it is the first place to cut if needed. Caleb Tingstad asks athletics if they would rather receive a cut equal to the enhancement requests and then receives the enhancements or not receive any cuts at all but receive enhancements. Glen Harris responds that they would rather not receive any cuts and could go through any enhancement requests as needed. Shelby Worthing notes that she is concerned that perhaps they are putting too much burden on the students who do not attend games. Glen Harris understands what she is saying but notes that the same could be said of other departments, yet the departments are making the opportunities available to all students.

Carter Craig, point of personal privilege at 2:41pm.

Patrick Moser notes that he was not asked if he would prefer to have his base budge instead of enhancement so he is unsure why that is part of the conversation at all.

Carter Craig back at 2:43pm.

Gary Dukes notes that he recalls Barb Dearing stating during their presentation that if her department was fully funded she could find a way to fund enhancement. Caleb Tingstad notes that it sound like everyone is ok with leaving it as is. Emily Searls states that she is uncomfortable with the notion that they can find the funds for enhancement but are also seeking an additional \$13,000. Brandon Neish explains that the increase may be increases in personnel, OPE, fees, and the administrative overhead attributed to those. Shelby Worthing notes that it is important to cut back on luxuries because

the fee continues increasing. Caleb Tingstad notes that some members are uncomfortable funding the request and asks for an alternative. Emily Searls noted that looking over the request she thought about allocating the required enhancements and not funding the increase in the base allocation. Shelby Worthing explains that her thought process has been the student number vs the dollars being used which is why she continues asking about student participation. While a \$10 increase does not seem like much at the time it may not be sustainable in the coming years.

Emily Searls notes that there is a \$13,000 increase in the base budget and \$37,000 in enhancement requests. She feels like at some point an area takes advantage by asking for so much. Juan Navarro agrees. Glen Harris notes that there were \$37,000 in enhancement requests but they were able to reduce it by about \$13,000. They are not sitting on the money for enhancement but rather were simply stating their needs. Randi Lydum adds that they are currently in the process of hiring a new director and revamping their program. They are hoping to develop an external focus and become more self-sustainable. Juan Navarro suggests cutting the department by \$13,000. Caleb Tingstad notes that the increase is due to mandatory increases. Brandon Neish notes the same could be said of various budgets. All areas are able to put in allowable increases but that does not mean the Committee is required to fund it. Caleb Tingstad agrees but also states that it is unfair to say an area is taking advantage for presenting their needs.

Juan Navarro, Emily Searls, and Asia Cohen all agree with a 1.1% cut. Caroline Basso understands that budgets need to increase but they cannot always have it all. Caleb Tingstad thinks that they are in a year where they can afford to fund more budgets at their base request. There might be an increase in enrollment and that could adjust the fee. Brandon Neish clarifies that the fee set this year will be the fee assessed to all students next year. If there were an increase in enrollment that would go towards over realized funds. Shelby Worthing notes the importance of considering whether first year and returning students will be able to afford the increase next year. She is in favor of a 1.1% reduction which would put them at their FY17 allocation of 1,290,000; the majority are in favor.

Carter Craig reminds the Committee that as they move into clip boarding and tabling they need to be very receptive of student opinions and have intentional conversations about what students' value.

Brandon Neish notes that with those adjustment there is a \$4 increase to the current Fee.

Carter Craig lets the Committee know that they will go down the list of enhancements and any enhancement that 3 or more people want to consider will be discussed.

Caleb Tingstad yields to the Chair at 3:05pm.

Below is a list of the enhancements to be discussed:

ASWOU  
Student Veterans of America  
African Student Friends Association

Campus Recreation  
Business Manager  
Women's Rugby  
Men's Soccer

Student Engagement  
OrgSync

Juan Navarro moves for a 5 minute recess. Shelby Worthing seconds. All in favor at 3:14pm. The meeting is reinstated at 3:19pm by Carter Craig, IFC Chair.

**Student Veterans of America - \$2,386 request**

Caleb Tingstad confirms that the club is not currently funded and asks for more information on the banquet they would like to put on. It is clarified by a club representative that the Memorial Day banquet was first held last year and is open to the campus and surrounding community. It is a great opportunity to educate others about Memorial Day, and provide a space for community building; there are over 100 student veterans on campus. Shelby Worthing explains that she wanted to consider the request because to be eligible to request funds they had to remain a club for six consecutive terms. That shows dedication to campus, they worked hard for the status and still put on a large event.

Brian Tesch notes there is also funding for a national conference in the request. He wants to be supportive and is in favor of the request because they have shown their willingness to be a club. Caleb Tingstad asks how they funded the Memorial Day banquet previously. A club representative explains that they received a lot of support from the community and the Veterans Success Center at WOU, as well the club's fundraising efforts. Juan Navarro likes the request and is in favor because he understands the need.

Shelby Worthing asks if the dinner would be free. The club representative notes they charged \$5 last year but it is not something that has been discussed for the current year since the committee for that event has just been formed. However, they did just set it up so that students would be able to purchase a meal ticket with their meal card. Shelby Worthing notes that her question had to do with concern over the event being free if students were paying for it but anyone could attend. Carter Craig notes that if there will be ticket sales then there will be revenue and suggests that be factored into the request.

Caleb Tingstad moves to fully fund the Student Veterans of America FY18 request. Emily Searls seconds.

Discussion

Juan Navarro is in full support. Caleb Tingstad notes that fact that the club had made it this far is a testament to their commitment and support. Lindsey Marquardt agrees but is hesitant about not reducing potential ticket sales from the funding request. Shelby Worthing notes that if the club wants to use the dinner as a fundraiser it is a great opportunity and if they choose not to then maybe students shouldn't be charged. Carter Craig notes that 32 of the 100 attendees were students. Travel to a national conference is also part of the request and that seems like a very beneficial thing for students.

The motion passes 9-0-0.

**African Students & Friends Association - \$1,236 request**

Juan Navarro moves to approve the African Students & Friends Association request. Caleb Tingstad seconds.

Discussion

Lindsey Marquardt notes that she is not super comfortable approving the request because it is fairly vague and there is no representative present for clarification. Gary Dukes notes that the club may not have been aware the discussion would be taking place. Leo Mejia notes that he contacted the club requesting additional details as well as updating them on the IFC meeting schedule. Lindsey notes that she would either like more information or for them to be a representative present.

The motion fails 0-8-1.

**Campus Recreation - Business Manager \$37,125**

Lindsey Marquardt moves to approve the business manager position. Asia Cohen seconds the motion.

Discussion

Brian Tesch notes that there is both an FTE salary and an increase. Rip Horsey explains that the position is currently .5fte. The request would be to get it to 1.0fte and cover the increase of the previous pay. Juan Navarro expresses his confusion in regards to trying to hire someone while other areas are taking cuts and asks how the student body will benefit. Rip Horsey directs the Committee to the information packet he provided during his presentation. The position could help facilitate centralized training, help and improve marketing for non-wou memberships which would increase the revenue among other things. Carter Craig thinks the building manager position would certainly be an improvement. Shelby Worthing asks how long the center has been at 3.5 staff members. Rip Horsey responds they've been at 3.5 staff members since March 21, 2011. Shelby Worthing points out that there has been a lot of growth in services since then. Caleb Tingstad notes that he does not think the enhancement is a good use of student dollars, especially when they spent a lot of time discussing \$1,000 for furniture cleaning and this request is \$40,000. The department has proven that they are able to function efficiently with their current staff.

Shelby Worthing notes that she continues going back to the amount of students and whether there is value there. When 79% of the student body utilizes the center that shows value. Emily Searls agrees there is value in it and asks if it would be a permanent enhancement. Rip Horsey confirms it would be an ongoing enhancement. Brian Tesch states that he is on the fence but is leaning towards a yes vote. Rip Horsey explains that they have been requesting the funds for several years to improve the way they run their office and show what more they can do. If they are already doing a good job, imagine what more could come of it with a full time person. Caleb Tingstad notes that he is not discounting the effect an added position would have on the overall efficiency but it would put a big burden on students. There is no way of knowing whether it will increase the number of students who is Campus Recreation. Lindsey Marquardt notes that the possibilities will be less limited and the Committee will be able to see what the results are the following year. If something is not done the staff will eventually get burnt out.

Leo Mejia suggests approving the position for one year to get results before making it a permanent enhancement. Rip Horsey explains that the position would not go into effect on July 1 so he would only be able to present half a year. The fact that the position would have previously been at .5fte should also be considered, they would not just be able to fall back to the previous job. Brandon Neish notes that the position would be classified and there are union rules in regards to layoffs bumping that would need to be considered.

The motion fails 4-4-0.

Rip Horsey explains that there will not be a single person at open hearings speaking in favor of a building because there is an assumption that buildings will remain open. Gary Dukes notes now is not the time for that discussion.

### **Women's Rugby - \$1,032 request**

Emily Searls moves to approve the Women's Rugby request. Asia Cohen seconds.

#### Discussion

Carter Craig notes that Men's Rugby has more funding and has the extra night of lodging built into their budget while Women's Rugby does not. Emily Searls does not see any issue with approving the request. Caleb Tingstad is opposed to funding the request because we are in a time when luxury items are not always available. Lindsey Marquardt notes that she thinks club sports sometimes get shafted, it is a small request/ Shelby Worthing would not call it a luxury but rather a matter of safety and fairness.

Cynthia Olivares agrees with Shelby and Lindsey. It is certainly a safety hazard to drive back from Ashland, Oregon after competing. Rip Horsey explains that students will be traveling on Friday since games are typically at 10am or 1pm on Saturday. Since matches run approximately 2 hours, students would be arriving sometime after 11pm. Juan Navarro agrees that is a safety concern. Leo Mejia notes that as a member of club sports he can verify that the 2 hour match time does not include the warm up time. Lindsey Marquardt notes that it would benefit the whole team for a small price. Caleb Tingstad disagrees with the safety concern point since the football has had similar trips. Though he acknowledges that they do not drive themselves he thinks the safety concern in being overstated. Shelby Worthing notes that because the Women's Rugby is driving themselves and the football team did not, it is not a good comparison. She adds that she like the request because it shows the support the University and students have for Club Sports. Caleb Tingstad notes that wanting to show support is not a good reason to fund the request, there are other ways that support could be shown. Carter Craig notes that it would be unjust not to fund the request because it is built into the Men's Rugby budget. He also adds that one extra night on a long trip is far from being a luxury and he looks forward to voting. The motion passes 8-1-0.

### **Men's Soccer - \$430 request**

The request is similar to that of Women's Rugby. Lindsey Marquardt move to approve the request. Emily Searls seconds the motion.

#### Discussion

Emily Searls notes that it is another safety concern. Juan Navarro agrees. Rip Horsey adds that even if they had an evening game the team would still need to be on their way by 5am to get there. He adds that Campus Recreation is trying to ensure their athletes are able to participate in their sport and return safely.

The motion passes 8-1-0.

#### **Student Engagement API- \$2,148 request**

Juan Navarro moves to approve the OrgSync enhancement. Asia Cohen seconds the motion.

#### Discussion

Shelby Worthing asks if they have someone to do the programming for the interface or if they will be relying on the ASWOU programmer. Patrick Moser explains that the current programs would continue but going forward they would need someone to create new ones by the ASWOU Programmer. If that position was not available they would work with UCS to try and get some of their projects going. Caleb Tingstad thinks it is a good enhancement because several students use the program and the student update would run a lot slower without the interface.

The motion passes 8-1-0.

Brandon Neish notes that the fee has increased \$4 due to base budgets and an additional \$1 from enhancement; a total increase of \$5.

#### **Summer**

Brandon Neish notes that the numbers are relatively close to last year's with the exception of allowable increases. Creative Arts has an increase for student wages, there's a reduction from combining WUC and SLA. To fund base budgets the fee would need to increase by \$21 for a total summer fee of \$154.

Shelby Worthing asks what the creative arts summer budget covers. Brandon Neish responds that it covers summer theatre, concerts and instrumental jazz. Caleb Tingstad notes he does not see much change from the previous year. Gary Duked noted that summer budgets do not even remotely cover the expenses associated with the Health & Wellness center or the Werner University Center. Shelby Worthing asks Patrick Moser if there is summer revenue. Patrick Moser responds that there is revenue in the operations budget.

#### **Creative Arts - \$34,225**

Lindsey Marquardt notes that a \$21 increase seem high. Creative Arts would be the easiest budget to cut because it is less operations and



more programming. Shelby Worthing notes there has been increased attendance in for outside theatre. She would be interested to know if music was still free in the summer. Carter Craig notes that 22,000 of the request goes towards summer theatre. Shelby Worthing notes that upon hearing that she feels that a cut would impact one of the few things offered in the summer. Caleb Tingstad notes that he would be comfortable with fully funding Creative Arts' summer request. The consensus is to fund at their request.

**Childcare - \$8,666**

Shelby Worthing, Juan Navarro, and Asia Cohen express their support for fully funding the Childcare summer request. The general consensus is to fully fund.

**Wellness Center - \$63,655**

Caleb Tingstad is in support of fully funding due to the building costs. Juan Navarro agrees. The general consensus is to fully fund the request.

**Student Engagement Operations - \$24,240**

There is a general consensus to fully fund due to the building costs.

**Leadership, Inclusion, & Activities - \$4,028**

Caleb Tingstad is in support of fully funding. Carter Craig notes that the majority is for Summer Heatwave concerts. Patrick Moser explains that the full budget is for Summer Heatwave concerts. The majority is in favor of fully funding.

**Campus Recreation Enhancement - \$2,835**

Brandon Neish explains that the summer allocation does not fully fund the operation costs. There is typically a deficit in both services and supplies and student pay; the enhancement would make up what summer tends to cost. Caleb Tingstad asks if it is a natural increase. Brandon Neish responds that the spending has consistently been there but not the needed funding. Darin Silbernagel notes that there is a formula that is normally used to try and spread out the costs but it may need to be reevaluated since enrollment has changed since it was put in place. If the enhancement is not approved the funds will come from their operations. The Committee unanimously agrees to fund it.

Caleb Tingstad moves to approve the budgets as follows:

Abby's House - \$7,081

Access - \$24,583

Creative Arts - \$265,339

Athletics - \$1,290,000

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 - \$1,283,137  
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 \$4,437, 195 (including rollover) with a \$4 increase to the fee.

#### Enhancements

ASWOU - \$2,386 for Student Veterans of America  
Campus Recreation - \$1,462 for travel increases to Women's Rugby and Men's Soccer.  
Student Engagement - \$2,148 or OrgSync API

A total of \$5,996 in enhancements, adding \$1 to the fee.  
This sets the fee at \$346 with a total increase of \$5.

#### Summer

Creative Arts - \$32,356  
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 \$4 setting the summer fee at \$154 with a \$21 increase

Caroline Basso seconds the motion.

#### Discussion

Carter Craig notes that he does not feel comfortable with some of the cuts but looks forward to student feedback.

The motion passes 8-1-0.

## 6. New Business

## 7. Subcommittee Report

## 8. Announcements

Carter Craig reminds Committee members that they are expected to attend as many open hearings as they are able to. He also adds that he will be presenting to the ASWOU Senate on Monday February 21 at 6pm and encourages other Committee members to attend.

**9. Adjournment**

Caleb Tingstad moves to adjourn the meeting. Juan Navarro seconds the motion. The motion passes 9-0-0 and the meeting adjourns at 4:51pm.

