

Incidental Fee Committee
Minutes

Meeting #9
February 15, 2016 6:00pm
Columbia Room, Werner University Center

1. **Call to Order**

The meeting is called to order at 6:01pm by Tom Peterson, IFC Chair.

2. **Roll Call**

IFC Members: Justin Ross, Shannon Haas, Robin Perkins, Tom Peterson, Jacob Marsh, Carter Craig, Lexie Widmer, Trey Shimabukuro and Caleb Tingstad.

Advisors: Darin Silbernagel, Director of Business Services; Gary Dukes, Vice President for Student Affairs; and Eric Yahnke, Vice President Finance & Administration.

Area Heads: Malissa Larson, Access; Keller Coker, Creative Arts; Patrick Moser, WUC/SLA/SAB; Adry Clark, Service Learning & Career Development; Rip Horsey, Campus Recreation; Rhys Finch, Student Media; and Ingrid Amerson, Childcare.

Other Representatives: Pat Ketchcham, Abby's House; Brandon Neish, Budget Office; Glen Harris, Athletics; Jenesa Ross, Student; Jessica Freeman, ASWOU Senate; and Corbin Garner, ASWOU President.

IFC Secretary:

Not Present: Mary Ellen Dello Stritto, Abby's House; Debbie Diehm, Wolf Ride; Sofia LeVernois, ASWOU; Adela Aguilar, IFC Secretary; and Barb Dearing, Athletics.

3. **Approval of Minutes**

a. **February 8, 2016**

Shannon Haas moves to table the approval of the minutes until the next meeting.
Robin Perkins seconds. The motion passes 8-0-0.

4. **Approval of the Agenda**

Justin Ross asks to add action item F to discuss the open hearings process. Tom Peterson points out it will be covered under old business.

Justin Ross moves to approve the agenda. Jacob Marsh seconds. The motion passes 8-0-0.

5. **Old Business**

a. **Reminders (Open Hearings, Breakout sessions)**

Tom Peterson goes over the breakout group process from the previous year and asks the Committee if they want to follow the same process. Shannon Haas thinks the breakout sessions are a good idea. Robin Perkins asks if returning Committee members felt they received the information they were seeking out of the breakout sessions. Carter Craig thought it worked well but notes it can be difficult to inform others on the process and fee quickly. Trey Shimabukuro found the breakout sessions were helpful as a student participant.

Gary Dukes recommends that at least two members participate in each sub-group and someone take minutes in order to share with the full Committee. He suggests that the Committee establish who will be paired together. Shannon Haas notes that she does not recall the members being split up by subcommittees. Justin Ross notes that they were previously split up by subcommittees but adds that the questions are generic.

Jessica Freeman reminds the Committee that the breakout sessions are part of the checklist.

Caleb Tingstad asks how the preliminary decision changed to the final decision in the previous year. Justin Ross notes that a personnel request from Campus Recreation was reversed and a 5% cut was given to Athletics following open hearings.

Gary Dukes notes that most students approve of raising the fee. The Committee needs to ask questions in order to receive good feedback. Jenesa Ross adds that it is rare for an uninvolved student to show up and encourages the Committee to pay close attention if one does.

Carter Craig notes that in the previous year the breakout sessions were not area focused and that enabled more organic discussion. Jenesa notes that when individuals signed in they were given a number to facilitate splitting the audience for breakout sessions.

Upon further discussion the Committee decides to count off in order to establish pairs for the breakout sessions.

- 1 – Justin Ross & Jacob Marsh
- 2 – Robin Perkins & Trey Shimabukuro
- 3 – Carter Craig & Caleb Tingstad
- 4 – Shannon Haas & Tom Peterson

It is established that the IFC Secretary will provide the materials necessary for breakout sessions.

Shannon Haas encourages the Committee members to advertise open hearings in their classes. Rip Horsey notes that when students walk into a building they do not understand that the hours may change due to fees. He adds that the Committee will not hear from many students concerning the building hours.

Keller Coker asks if the breakout sessions will occur after the open hearing. Gary Dukes responds that they occurred following open hearings in the previous year.

He also notes that the Committee consider time limits. Justin Ross notes that the previous year consisted of two minutes for individuals and four minutes for groups. He adds that Childcare usually goes first, general student comments follow, and then they do the breakout session.

6. New Business

a. ASWOU - OrgSync Programmer

Justin Ross asks whether ASWOU has the funding available for the position. Corbin Garner confirms they are able to fund the position by reallocating funds. Jacob Marsh notes that he supports the position. Gary Dukes questions whether they have been presented with a job description and rate of pay. Corbin Garner explains that both items were included in the ASWOU PowerPoint presentation. Shannon Haas asks if they have confirmed the position with University Computing Services (UCS). Corbin Garner confirms they have.

Shannon Haas moves to approve the OrgSync Programmer position. Jacob Marsh seconds.

Discussion

Lexie Widmer asks if the position will be replacing any previous positions and where the position will be housed. Corbin Garner notes that it will not be replacing any other positions and it will be paid by ASWOU but will be working with UCS. The position and desk space has been approved by UCS. Lexie Widmer asks who will be hiring for the positions. Corbin Garner notes that hiring will be tasked to ASWOU and SLA. Patrick Moser adds that he imagines they will also utilize UCS expertise during the hiring process. Lexie Widmer asks why the position is being housed under UCS. Corbin Garner notes that the decision was made based on access to equipment, and informative supervisions. The position will be able to work in the evenings when the network sees less traffic. Robin Perkins asks what the anticipated starting date will be. Corbin Garner responds that the position would start in mid-September like the rest of cabinet. Lexie Widmer asks what kind of training ASWOU has in mind to get students up to programmer. Corbin Garner intends to use students from the Computer Science Program under the supervision of UCS. Lexie Widmer notes that bringing in a student programmer is a pretty tall order. She asks if there is an expectation that UCS will train the student. Corbin Garner notes there is not training expectation but UCS has agreed to assist when needed. Patrick Moser notes there is a student currently working on UCS projects that is trained and qualified.

The motion passes 7-1-0.

b. Natural Science Club – Travel Change Request

The Natural Science Club is requesting to change the destination for their Spring Break trip from Utah to the Redwoods.

Justin Ross notes that there is no budgetary impact and asks if they are taking more or less students. The Club representative responds that they will be traveling with less students but believes that traveling to the Redwoods was always the intent. Justin Ross asks for the cost of the trip. The cost is \$5,800 and two advisors will be travelling with the group.

Caleb Tingstad supports the club's request.

Shannon Haas moves to allow Natural Science to change their destination from Utah to Redwoods. Jacob Marsh seconds.

Lexie Widmer questions how the costs can remain the same if Redwoods is closer than Utah. It is established that participants are being charged less to attend. Robin Perkins asks how much students were previously charged. It is established that club members were previously asked to pay between \$100 and \$150 to participate.

Tom Peterson, IFC Chair, questions whether Carter Craig is able to vote since he stepped away from his placard. It is established that Carter Craig cannot vote.

Carter Craig notes that he approves of the destination change. The motion passes 7-0-1 (Carter Craig abstains).

c. **WOUPSA – T-Shirt/Sweatshirt Request**

WOUPSA is requesting to reallocate travel funds to services & supplies to cover the cost of shirts and sweaters for their executive board. The travel budget allocation does not cover the cost needed to travel to the annual conference.

Robin Perkins asks if the current request was the same as last week's in which the Committee had several questions. Tom Peterson confirms that is the case and pulls up the questions from his e-mail.

The Club representative explains what WOUPSA is.

Tom Peterson asks why the travel budget has not been fully utilized in the past. The Club representative is unsure due to there being different leadership each year. They note that for the current year their travel allocation is insufficient to fund their conference travel.

Tom Peterson asks why the club is seeking funding for both t-shirts and sweatshirts. The Club representative is unsure. The club did not discuss which would be best to promote the club.

Robin Perkins asks if the club is requesting funding for both apparel items. The Club notes they are requesting \$250 to pay for t-shirts and/or sweatshirts. Tom

Peterson notes that based on prior e-mails it seems the club is looking to purchase both t-shirts and sweatshirts.

Tom Peterson questions why WOUPSA is unable to pitch in personals funds. The Club notes that the cost of a speaker from last year was charged to the current year. Gary Dukes asks if the club already has clothing in their budget. The Club is unsure since the treasurer handles finances but they were unable to attend the meeting. Jenesa Ross notes that the initial question was in regards to why club members were unable to pitch in for the apparel. The Club notes that the students are financially unable to contribute.

Robin Perkins asks if the current trip would be open to all members or just the executive board. The Club establishes that it would be open to all club members.

Shannon Haas questions whether the funds could be better utilized and if that had been considered before deciding on an apparel purchase. The Club notes they will be moving money around due to the funds currently available to the club. They plan to move funding into S7S to cover a potential speaker for the Academic Excellence Showcase. Corbin Garner notes that ASWOU is able to move funds around but a clothing purchase would still require IFC approval.

Justin Ross moves to allow WOUPSA to move funds between travel and S&S based on the request.

Justin Ross withdraws his motion.

Justin Ross moves to allow WOUPSA to move \$245 to purchase apparel.

Shannon Haas seconds.

Discussion

Shannon Haas thinks the funds would be better spent on campus for all students.

Lexie Widmer agrees. Since the funding was originally for travel she wishes the club could have found a closer event.

Robin Perkins wants the funding to benefit more than just the executive members.

Jacob Marsh agrees with Committee members. He suggests potentially approving funds for the t-shirts and not the sweaters.

The motion fails 0-8-0.

Shannon Haas moves to allow WOUPSA to move \$95 for t-shirts. Robin Perkins seconds.

Discussion

Lexie Widmer questions whether a partial approval would still be beneficial to the club. The Club notes that if they were able to purchase the t-shirts that would be sufficient for the time being. Lexie Widmer thinks that doing a partial approval makes it more difficult for the club. Shannon Haas asks for clarification. Lexie Widmer notes that if they split the funding there could be less funding available

for other events. Robin Perkins notes that the \$95 was the amount requested by the club for t-shirts and they could use the remainder of the funds for other events.

Justin Ross asks how much money is left in their budget after the extra costs incurred this year.

Carter Craig notes it would be unusual for IFC to approve clothing purchases as it typically benefits an individual. An argument could be made for the public relations aspect but there are cheaper options out there. He does not think it is a good use of IFC funds.

The motion passes 6-2-0.

d. **ASWOU – Add Enhancement Request**

Corbin Garner explains that the Triangle Alliance enhancement request is being resubmitted after being corrected. ASWOU rules require that it be brought back to the Committee.

Justin Ross notes that enhancements will be discussed later and questions whether they can move on to preliminary decisions. Corbin Garner notes it should probably be voted on since the request is being resubmitted. Gary Dukes agrees. Justin Ross notes that he has filled out forms incorrectly and can understand that it happens. He adds that given how the Committee has been feeling about the fee it may not be approved. Carter Craig agrees that it may not be approved but thinks it should still be up for consideration.

Shannon Haas moved to allow the Triangle Alliance request to be submitted for discussion. Jacob Marsh seconds.

Discussion

Robin Perkins notes that it seems fair.

Jacob Marsh agrees that it should be discussed.

Shannon Haas, Trey Shimabukuro, and Caleb Tingstad agree.

The motion passes 8-0-0.

e. **Preliminary Decision (continued...)**

Extraordinary Travel - \$6,000

Shannon Haas asks if they are going to follow a similar pattern or do something different. Brandon Neish responds that the Committee can proceed however they would like. Robin Perkins asks to see the 2% cut column on the screen as well. Brandon Neish puts it up.

Justin Ross gives a brief explanation of the extraordinary travel fund. He notes that he originally cut \$1,000 of it in his proposal to help decrease the fee. Shannon Haas did the same.

Robin Perkins asks how much the fund has been used in the past. Gary Dukes responds that in the previous year, \$3,200 was allocated to 4 groups. Trey Shimabukuro asks how that compares to past years. Darin Silbernagel notes that it was low in comparison to past years. The requests were nearly double the year before last. Justin Ross notes that the extraordinary travel budget fluctuates as needs vary. He commends area heads for planning ahead and not having to make requests of the Committee.

Shannon Haas moves to allocate \$5,000 to extraordinary travel. Trey Shimabukuro seconds.

Discussion

Caleb Tingstad thinks it is a good idea.

Carter Craig notes that with cuts across the board, the fund may be needed and in favor of the decrease.

Jacob Marsh is also in favor of the decrease since it follows the current trend.

Robin Perkins is ok with the proposed cut.

Shannon Haas notes that more people may be coming forward with requests but the reason for budget cuts is to keep the fee from being too high. Some may need to fundraise or contribute personal funds to travel.

Lexie Widmer is in favor of the cut but is saddened as she feels that groups that have a once in a lifetime opportunity may not have the option.

The motion passes 8-0-0.

Campus Recreation – Wellness Center

Justin Ross agrees with Rip's comment in regards to buildings being available to students. He feels that the Committee should avoid cuts to this and the WUC for that reason.

Trey Shimabukuro asks if any of the 5% cuts changed from subcommittee. Rip Horsey responds that the only numbers that may change are related to new rules related to student sick leave at 1 hour for every 30 hours worked. Federal government may change rules related to overtime as well so financial needs may change based on new regulations.

Tom Peterson asks how Committee members get to their allocation proposals.

Caleb Tingstad responds that since the idea was to cut most budgets he proposed a reduction in the effort to be fair. Did not spend a lot of time on his decision and would be open to hear other opinions. Carter Craig notes that he made his decision based on preventing major increases to the fee.

Rip Horsey goes over the stats on facility use presented during the budget presentation. Jacob Marsh asks what the possible effects of the minimum wage hike will have on budgets and OPE. Gary Dukes notes that any changes to salary will be covered by the IFC reserves. Rip Horsey clarifies that sick leave will be

covered this year but not in future years by the IFC reserves. Eric Yahnke confirms that is correct.

Shannon Haas thinks the Wellness Center is important to the success of many students but also feels that the fee needs to be decreased if possible.

Shannon Haas moves to allocate a 2% reduction to Campus Recreation – Wellness Center's requested amount. Trey Shimabukuro seconds the motion.

Discussion

Tom Peterson asks how a 2% reduction would impact the operational hours. Rip Horsey responds it would impact their lowest staffed hours which would be some weekends and Friday nights as well as some programs (fitness classes, outdoor program).

Trey Shimabukuro believes the center is a unique draw to a campus of WOU's size. He adds that a 2% cut is not ideal but must be done in the current climate. Jacob Marsh notes that he used the center a lot during his first year at WOU to decompress but believes that with the enrollment decline, a decrease is smart and needed.

Justin Ross notes that just because there has been a 2% reduction to some areas it does not require other areas take a similar reduction. He adds that the Committee needs additional justification for something that impacts half or more of the student body.

Carter Craig notes that 76% of the student body uses the center but 100% of them pay the fee. His intent is to try and ensure that the costs associated with funded areas is in line with enrollment.

Shannon Haas agrees, she does not want to see a significant increase to the fee.

Caleb Tingstad thinks that the 2% reduction is a difficult but necessary given the enrollment and the cost of the fee.

Lexie Widmer notes that the Committee should at least comment on all the data provided at their request. She specifically asked for the ratio of users in the building to staff members to see if there were any areas where costs could be cut. Looking at the data it appears there is a potentially insignificant trend of keeping staffing the same (increased in one occasion) when there are less users in the building. Knows that saying a 2% cut is needed sounds like a very simple statement but there is much more beneath that.

Rip Horsey notes that the Committee has spent 15 minutes on a \$900,000 budget when last week they spent hours on a \$6,000 budget last week. He adds that it can be difficult to explain why hours are reduced and even harder to get students to attend open hearings. Shannon Haas notes that it is a preliminary decision so that students know where the Committee is coming from and she looks forward to receiving student input to take into consideration upon final decision.

Lexie Widmer notes that the annual unique participants are decreasing and the preliminary decision needs to reflect that.

The motion passes 7-1-0.

Campus Recreation – Club Sports

Rip Horsey notes that when the original worksheets were put up the Dance Team funding had not been moved over from Athletics. The correction was made after the proposals were put up.

Lexie Widmer asks for the ration of women and men participants. Rip Horsey responds that there are currently 100 male athletes and 56 female athletes.

Tom Peterson asks if those who provided proposals kept the dance team situation in mind. Justin Ross notes that he went off the numbers in the column. It appears that the cut would be in the amount of the dance team funds which would be unfortunate but that is just how it worked out.

Shannon Haas asks how a cut would impact club sports. Rip Horsey explains that he would have a conversation with all the sports to see where they wanted to take the cuts. More than likely the cuts will impact services & supplies since they already have to do significant fundraising for travel.

Lexie Widmer asks who covers an injury for club sports participants. Rip Horsey responds that it is typically covered by a student's personal insurance.

Trey Shimabukuro asks for clarification on the retention columns for club sports retentions. Rip Horsey explains that the left column includes the funded clubs while the right side is for the non-funded clubs.

Lexie Widmer notes that club sports reminds her of ASWOU in that they are by students, for students.

Lexie moves to fully fund club sports for FY17. Caleb Tingstad seconds.

Discussion

Caleb Tingstad agrees with Lexie.

Shannon Haas would not like to cut travel but does think there should be a cut.

Jacob Marsh questions the logic of not cutting club sports on the basis that they directly impact students but all areas could be seen as directly impacting students.

Lexie Widmer advocates for fully funding because club sports take a significant risk when participating. Robin Perkins and Justin Ross ask for clarification. Lexie Widmer notes that she took the potential cost of an injury into consideration.

Carter Craig notes he will not be taking that into consideration when making a funding decision because there is some risk in any participation and the student is aware of it. He will focus on the impact to the fee and the student body as a whole.

Motion fails 1-7-0.

Shannon Haas moves to cut club sports FY17 request by 2%. Robin Perkins seconds.

Carter Craig thinks a 2% cut is better than no cut at all. Shannon Haas asks those who voted against fully funding for reasoning and if they have a different proposal.

Trey Shimabukuro notes he was on the fence about it because he would not like for there to be a negative impact on travel.

Robin Perkins thinks a decrease is necessary due to the enrollment decline. Justin Ross is the opinion that the proposed decrease is not significant. He also notes that if the Committee intends to cut everyone by 2% then it could all be done in one motion. Otherwise the Committee needs to start considering deeper cuts.

Jacob Marsh notes that he is a fan of not making major cuts because it is important to ensure that they are also maintain an adequate level of service.

Shannon Haas notes that in per proposal she had a larger cut but proposed 2% since that is what the Committee seemed to be comfortable with and she wanted to get a dialogue started.

Justin Ross asks if the Committee is comfortable with a 5% cut. Shannon Haas notes that in her proposal she suggested a 3% cut and would not be comfortable with a 5% cut. Patrick Moser asks Justin if his comments are in regards to the Club Sports budgets or all the areas. Justin Ross notes that part of it is a frustration in regards to the discussion happening with all the areas. He started out his proposal by cutting 5% across the board before deciding that did not seem fair; there are some areas that could take bigger cuts than other areas. Robin Perkins notes that perhaps the Committee should focus on the motion on the table as opposed to the budget as a whole. Jessica Freeman agrees that the discussion needs to revolve around the motion currently on the table.

Justin Ross moves to amend the motion to give club sports a 3% reduction from their request. Robin Perkins seconds.

Discussion – Amendment

Shannon Haas agrees with the amendment because it is a small percentage of students (unfortunately) and there is a decline in enrollment.

Trey is in agreement but hopes it will not have a negative impact on their travel.

The amendment passes 7-1-0.

Discussion – amended motion

Shannon Haas is in agreement with a 3% reduction.

Caleb Tingstad feels there other places where cuts could be made instead.
Jacob Marsh is ok with a 3% reduction on a preliminary level but would want to hear from students before making a final decision.
Lexie Widmer stands by the Committee.
Robin Perkins notes that all the cuts, even small ones, will impact the fee in the end.

The motion passes 7-1-0

Campus Recreation – Intramurals

Shannon Haas recognizes that there has been a decline in involvement of intramurals and thinks a 3% reduction may be necessary. Tom Peterson asks how a cut would impact the budget. Rip Horsey responds that there would be a reduction in student labor, impact on league play, repairs and supplies.

Justin Ross asks if the majority of the budget is student labor. Rip Horsey responds that it is. Robin Perkins asks where the student participation fee goes. Rip Horsey responds that it can be seen on the budget worksheets under revenue and it is used to offset the costs.

Jacob Marsh thinks intramurals is a good resource to have on campus in terms of student jobs. Tom Peterson asks how many students are employed. Rip Horsey responds that it depends on the term but there are typically about 40 student employees per term. Shannon Haas notes that the Committee has previously impacted student wages in their preliminary decision. Carter Craig had a deeper cut in his proposal because intramurals already includes the culture of paying to participate. Trey Shimabukuro asks if the budget was cut in the previous year. Rip Horsey responds that there was not a cut in the previous year but some funds were moved. Shannon Haas believes there is some wiggle room based off of the history provided.

Robin Perkins moves to fund intramurals at 96% of their FY17 request. There is no second and the motion dies.

Lexie Widmer notes that intramurals pulls in about the same number of students across the different years. Robin Perkins thinks it is a great opportunity for non-athletes to get involved in. Rip Horsey notes that they also see several athletic teams participate during their off season.

Caleb Tingstad notes that he is a little biased as a participant but thinks it is a great opportunity to get out there and meet other people. He adds that it would be very unfortunate to see a sport/opportunity potentially lost.

Shannon Haas is ok with a 4% decrease.

Caleb Tingstad asks the Committee to consider the funds that would be cut since it will not reduce a dollar off the fee but it will have a great impact on the program.

Lexie Widmer notes that the Committee has asked several areas about charging students to participate and intramurals is one of the few areas already doing so.

Jenesa Ross questions why the Committee is considering a 4% cut now and not with any other budget. Caleb Tingstad notes that he is not happy with how they, as a Committee, has been looking over budgets and thinks some areas can take bigger cuts than other. He also reiterates that the cut is not significant enough to impact the fee but it will be a significant impact to the program.

Shannon Haas notes that she is ok with the 4% cut because there is a decline in participation and their history shows that they have not fully utilized their funding in the past.

Rip Horsey notes that he is the only area head that provided significant data. He understands that there is decline in enrollment but he would question whether the decrease in participation is declining at the same rate. He also adds that it is important not to go negative and that sometimes means leaving some funds for unforeseen expenses.

Jacob Marsh agrees with Caleb Tingstad.

Justin Ross understand what Jacob and Caleb are saying. No, small cuts may not instantly affect the fee but when they are added together it impacts the fee as a whole. In that notion it would seem that the Committee is either advocating for larger cuts or no cuts at all.

Robin Perkins moves to fund intramurals at 96% of their request. Lexie Widmer seconds.

The motion fails 2-6-0.

Discussion

Caleb Tingstad asks the Committee if they are leaning towards bigger cuts or fully funding. Trey Shimabukuro would like to see it fully funded. Robin Perkins thinks the objective is to keep the fee increase to a minimum and asks the Committee to keep in mind that some deeper cuts may become necessary.

Patrick Moser thinks it is a valid point but one that should have been noted at the beginning of the process. Robin Perkins notes that in the sense of fairness it should be something considered in the final decision. Tom Peterson discourages Committee members from justifying decisions in the name of fairness as he would like a better justification to present to the ASWOU Senate.

Patrick Moser clarifies that his intent was not to tell the Committee to do things a certain way but rather to request consistent justification if they change their mode of operation.

Caleb Tingstad moves to fully fund the Campus Recreation intramural request.
Lexie seconds the motion.

Discussion

Justin Ross agrees with Lexie in the sense that intramurals affects different groups and all years (freshmen-seniors) on campus.

Jacob Marsh is in favor of fully funding based on what other Committee members have shared.

Trey Shimabukuro has participated in intramurals for 6 years and has never had a negative experience. Looking at the data it really shows the diverse groups affected.

Shannon has notes that she is still in favor of cutting intramurals based on the number of participants and how it relates to the full student body.

Carter Craig is disappointed in the Committee's thought process because the justification for fully funding is one that could be used for all areas. He would like the preliminary decisions to reflect the reality of the decline in enrollment.

Glen Harris understands that cuts are being made because there is a decrease in enrollment. However, there is hope that enrollment will increase in the near future. Once a budget is cut they will need to submit enhancement requests to get back to their pre-cut funding. He asks the Committee if there is a way to make it so that budgets that are cut can be brought back to pre-cut funding if enrollment increases. Because the Committee is in a current motion the question cannot be discussed.

The motion passes 5-3-0.

Tom Peterson calls for a 5 minute break at 8:46pm to reconvene at 8:51pm.

The meeting is called back to order (exact time was not present in the recording).

Student Leadership & Activities (SLA)

Caleb Tingstad notes that someone will propose no cuts or huge cuts and then the Committee will settle on a 2% cut. Based on the notion that the Committee wants to be fair and consider the impact to the fee he thinks they should give all the remaining budgets a 2% cut and then reanalyze how they are making their decisions.

Shannon Haas would be ok with softly agreeing on a 2% cut but then discussing them individually. She thinks they should all be discussed and individually voted on.

Corbin Garner does not think it is very fair to approach the remaining budgets with an automatic 2% cut because when they take the time to discuss the budgets other decisions are agreed upon.

Justin Ross notes that SLA does a lot of programming around campus. Programs such as the Holiday Tree Lighting and Family Weekend. They impact a large group of students and get them involved.

Robin Perkins agrees and thinks that SLA has a big impact on the campus and community culture. He also feels that they encourage leadership development within their programs.

Shannon Haas notes that she is on the fence in regards to fully funding SLA. She agrees that they have a lot to offer but at the same time she does not want to see a major impact to the fee.

Lexie Widmer notes that looking at their budget it appears that they have a significant amount of carryforward. She also asks what expenses would fall under other professional services. Patrick Moser responds that those costs are associated with bringing an act or speaker to campus in which there is a contract fee. Lexie Widmer asks if there is specific reasoning for the consistent carryforward. Patrick Moser notes that he is sure there is but he started in the department in October of 2012. He adds that the carryforward from last year was significantly less than previous years because he put budget controls in place as he believes it is important to spend allocated dollars within the same year. Brandon Neish notes that some of the carryforward could be attributed to salary savings.

Lexie Widmer asks if there is anything that Patrick has been doing to try and save money. Patrick Moser clarifies that the budget controls he previously mentioned were put in place to ensure they spend their funds as opposed to saving them. Previous IFCs have not been in favor of saving funds. Most of his experience is from Housing and they tried to save as much as possible to spend it on something else (different funding source). That is not allowed within IFC. If they receive a cut they will make the appropriate decreases but the goal is that when they are given a budget they are expected to fully utilize it in the best way possible

Shannon Haas notes that in looking at the 5% cut package she notices that item 3 was eliminate dead week programming and item 5 was downgrading Leadership Recognition Night. She is curious as to why it was listed in that order as she would, personally, choose to downgrade the dinner before eliminating the dead week activities. Patrick Moser notes that coming up with cut packages is very difficult. Their cut packages are a result of meetings with several professional staff to evaluate what would impact students the most. If they do receive a cut he will take her opinion forward. While they have presented their plan for potential cuts it would all be reevaluated if they were assessed a cut and any and all feedback would be considered.

Jacob Marsh explains he has not spoken up because he is evaluating all the information to determine a potential cut that is appropriate to the budget based on the student impact. He would like to propose a 2% cut and asks what his fellow Committees think about it.

Caleb Tingstad would be ok with a 2% decrease.

Carter Craig thinks a 2% cut is a good place to start the conversation.

Trey Shimabukuro agrees that it would be a good place to start the conversation.

Justin Ross notes he could be at peace with that.

Jacob Marsh moves to fund SLA at a 2% cut of their FY17 request. Trey Shimabukuro seconds.

Discussion

Jacob Marsh likes the 2% cut because he is a fan of paying a little more to maintain a good service going.

Shannon Haas agrees with a minimum of a 2% cut. She adds that she would be ok with a higher cut since they may not need as many activities on campus with the decrease in enrollment.

Jenesa Ross notes that several of the events that SLA puts on bring non-students to campus. Events such as the Holiday Tree Lighting and Leadership Recognition Night; something to consider.

Trey Shimabukuro agrees that the department does provide opportunities for community members to be on campus. He is fond of the Holiday Tree Lighting and did not see it on the 5% cut package. He is comfortable with a 2% as he does not think the program would be affected.

Shannon Haas asks Robin and Justin to clarify what they mean when they say they are at peace with a 2%. Robin Perkins responds that he would not like to see a bigger cut. Justin Ross understands the needs to maintain the fee small. He also thinks the budget has a very unique way of reaching the community. He understands the necessity of cuts which is why he is comfortable with a 2% but would be opposed to a 5%.

The motion passes 8-0-0.

Student Leadership & Activities (SLA) – Student Activities Board (SAB)

Carter Craig notes that SAB provides similar services as SLA but with the added benefit of it being student run; a great experience for students. He would be in favor of a 25 reductions.

Caleb Tingstad is also in favor of a 2% cut.

Justin Ross feels that the previous conversation is applicable to this budget. He would love to see it fully funded but understands that the Committee may be more in line with a 2% cut.

Jacob Marsh also agrees with a 2% decrease.

Justin Ross moves that SLA-SAB receive a 2% cut setting the budget \$59,596.

Jacob Marsh seconds.

Discussion

Shannon Haas is in agreement with a 2% cut and thinks there is room within the budget to accommodate it.

Trey Shimabukuro agrees, there are a lot of great programs coming out of SAB but there is a need for decreases. New Student Week activities are one of his favorites and hope they will not be negatively impacted.

Patrick Moser clarifies that New Student Week is funded out of several areas, the main fund is through the matriculation fees.

The motion passes 8-0-0.

Service Learning & Career Development

Carter Craig thinks it is extremely important to keep services such as WolfLink. Justin Ross asks if Carter has used WolfLink because it does not appear to be fully utilized given that other areas post through OrgSync. Carter Craig responds that he has been on it once before and would argue that it is underutilized. He also thinks it could be more useful than an etiquette dinner.

Shannon Haas notes that she has used WolfLink to both find a job and advertise for an open position in her office. She has also been utilizing it to see if there are jobs available off campus for post-graduation.

Gary Dukes adds that off campus recruiters would not be able to advertise through OrgSync but would be able to go through WolfLink.

Lexie Widmer is also in favor of fully funding SLCD. She thinks that students come to WOU and get through a degree for the sole purpose of getting a job.

They resume and interview resources are invaluable for students. Went through SLCD and was given multiple resources that led her to a great internship.

Trey Shimabukuro is also a fan of fully funding SLCD. Cutting the budget would take opportunities to further their education and careers away from students.

Shannon Haas notes that their cut packages consist of capping student attendees to their dinners. She is in agreement with Carter, would like to see a decrease that would not impact WolfLink.

Jenesa Ross questions whether the SLCD budget has changed because it was her understanding that it mainly covered the events and WolfLink. Corbin Garner notes that the budget did not change and that in looking at their worksheet it is clear that they fund WolfLink, other software and etiquette dinners.

Justin Ross moves that SLCD receive a 5% cut setting the budget at \$7,646.

Carter Craig seconds.

Discussion

Shannon Haas is in agreement with the 5% cut. She understands that they cannot dictate where the cuts are dealt she is confident they will maintain WolfLink.

Jacob marsh is in agreement as he does not feel that the students will feel a large impact.

Carter Craig notes that the department would still be holding the same events with modifications and is in agreement with a 5% cut.

Robin Perkins has never attended and etiquette dinner but would be in favor of 5% cut.

Tom Peterson notes that he attended one and thought it was a good experience in which he learned a lot.

Trey Shimabukuro would be in favor of fully funding.

Caleb Tingstad is ok with a 5% cut.

Lexie Widmer does not agree with a 5% cut and looking at e budget they have been consistent and have not requested additional funds. She also questions where else students will gain the etiquette dinner experience if not from SLCD.

The motion passes 6-2-0.

Werner University Center

Shannon Haas is not in favor of a 5% cut to the WUC. She's not opposed to reducing some building hours but notes that in the 5% cut package it could impact WOU Mania and she would not be ok with that.

Tom Peterson reiterates Rip Horsey's comment in regards to students not being aware of funding and how it relates to reduced building hours.

Jacob Marsh, Caleb Tingstad and Trey Shimabukuro are opposed to a 5% cut.

Lexie Widmer notes that many students, in her experience, already assume the WUC is closed on the weekends.

Caleb Tingstad asks the Committee how they would feel about a 2% cut.

Carter Craig thinks it may be an easier decision at a 2% cut.

Robin Perkins thinks the WUC is an important building and a typical starting point.

Caleb Tingstad points out it is almost 10pm and that the Committee should probably go ahead and vote on whether or not to extend the meeting.

Justin Ross moves to extend the meeting to midnight. Robin Perkins seconds. The motion passes (vote numbers not present in the recording).

Carter Craig moves to allocate \$949,920 to the WUC for FY17. Justin Ross seconds.

Discussion

Shannon Haas likes the number because it encompasses the first four items noted on their 5% cut package. Understands it could impact hours but she was unaware that it was even open on Sundays.

Trey Shimabukuro is in agreement. Especially because it should not impact the rotation of furniture and other building maintenance needs.

Patrick Moser clarifies the Sunday hours by stating that only the ground floor is open with the intent of giving students access to the conference rooms and the computer lab.

Robin Perkins thinks it would be valuable for the WUC to reevaluate the hours that they are open. He asks the Committee to consider that they are cutting a 10hr position.

Justin Ross asks if there is an idea of how many people utilize the computer lab on Sundays. Patrick Moser notes there are a few ways that he can gather that information for the Committee to consider during final decisions.

Lexie Widmer notes that there is a line item for clothing in the budget and asks if there is a replacement cycle. Patrick Moser responds that there is a replacement cycle. All employees have a polo that is worn while they are working. The department is going through a name change and they will reevaluate the cycle at that time.

The motion passes 8-0-0.

Enhancements

Shannon Haas notes that when putting together her proposal she did not grant any enhancements but would consider partially funding the official fees for Athletics.

Justin Ross notes that when looking over the requests the one that he felt strongly about was the Acapella Club enhancement. It would help cover the costs of their competition and this is the first year they are eligible to request funding. Would not be ok with funding their apparel but would be in favor of funding the \$350.

Tom Peterson notes that they are currently looking at a \$13 increase to the fee and asks Brandon Neish how much more would be needed to get to \$14. Brandon Neish responds that the fee increase is currently at \$12 and notes there are \$9,305 that could be allocated before reaching the a \$14 increase.

Robin Perkins asks if it is a normal trend to leave some funds available. Brandon Neish notes that Darin may be better equipped to answer the question. Darin Silbernagel responds that is allows for some flexibility.

Caleb Tingstad asks if all the enhancements need to be discussed.

Jacob Marsh notes that he would be willing to consider the Acapella Club enhancement and the Officiating one out of Athletics.

Lexie Widmer notes that the enhancements should be considered individually since area heads have taken the time to prepare them. Robin Perkins agrees.

Justin Ross notes that there is a budget note dictating how enhancements should be handled but the Committee has not followed it. He would suggest going about it on a departmental basis.

Keller Coker notes that in the previous year they did a quick straw poll and if 5 people wanted to discuss it then it was looked at. Justin Ross notes that that was a point of contention with the ASWOU Senate last year because only items with enough votes would be considered. He suggests doing a straw poll but it only needing 3 members wanted to discuss it.

Lexie Widmer notes that she is uncomfortable with the notion of rushing through the enhancements. Darin Silbernagel notes that the goal is to be done at midnight but the meetings have gone over. Tom Peterson notes that he would prefer to keep the meeting at midnight because he needs sleep and that was something that was established from the beginning.

Caleb Tingstad asks area heads if they are comfortable with the straw poll plan. Jacob marsh notes he does not think the straw poll will be much of a detriment since he had previously looked over the enhancements.

Patrick Moser, Keller Coker, and Glen Harris are all comfortable with the Committee's plan.

Rip Horsey notes that area heads spend a lot of time putting the enhancements together. Understands that a quick discussion happens but would request more than a quick glance. Since the majority of the area heads are ok moving forward he is ok with it.

ASWOU

Ed Club Enhancement - 1

Acapella Club -

Triangle Alliance Club Funding – 2

Creative Arts

Ongoing Equipment Enhancement – 3

Additional funds for Student pay – 3

Athletics

Increasing Travel for Sports –

Official Fees –

Uniforms – 0

Weight Room Assistant Coach –

Recovery System – 3

Camus Recreation

Personnel – 2

Outdoor programs – 0

Fitness Specialist –

SLA
Weekend Programming –
WUC
Wolfie – 4
Student wages – 1

Acapella Club

travel.
Jacob Marsh could like to limit it to the \$350 requested that are associated with

Shannon Haas agrees that if she were to vote for funding it would only be for the travel costs. However, she would rather not fund it at all.

Caleb Tingstad is in favor of the travel request.

Justin Ross notes that the travel funds being requested only cover the cost of one group and they would still need to fundraise for the other. He also adds that they club has been around for 4 years but there are rules as to when they can request funds.

Jacob marsh moves to allocate \$350 for travel expenses to the Acapella Club.
Caleb Tingstad seconds.

Discussion

Jacob Marsh works with several of the students involved and they work very hard. Shannon Haas would be ok with funding the \$350 and thinks it would be a great way to get WOU's name out there.

Robin Perkins is in agreement of funding the travel costs.

The motion passes 8-0-0.

Justin Ross notes that they allocated \$350 but it does not include administrative overhead fee. He asks the Committee if they are comfortable with that or if they would like to also allocate the overhead.

Justin Ross moves that Acapella Club should be granted \$376 for travel. Jacob Marsh seconds.

Discussion

Corbin Garner notes that the motion does not differentiate between administrative overhead and travel. Patrick Moser questions why the motion is not just for the overhead.

Tom Peterson notes that he does not think it makes a difference if it is approved or not.

Corbin Garner notes that in the previous year it had to be stipulated in the motion so as to avoid confusion. Patrick Moser notes that administrative overhead was not added to enhancement requests and feels that it should automatically be added.

Justin Ross withdraws his motion.

Creative Arts – Ongoing equipment

Justin Ross likes the idea of the enhancement and understand that budgets are tight.

Jacob Marsh appreciates, as an artist, to be able to stay with the times.

Shannon Haas agrees but is unsure if it is worthy of funding at this particular time.

Robin Perkins clarifies what the enhancement is wanting to purchase. Caleb Tingstad and Lexie Widmer are opposed to funding in the current financial climate.

Shannon Haas moves to allocate \$1,000 plus the applicable administrative overhead to the ongoing equipment replacement request. Jacob Marsh seconds on the basis of wanting to hear the discussion.

Discussion

Robin Perkins asks for clarification as to why the motion is for \$1,000. Shannon Haas yields her response to Carter. Carter Craig responds that he is keeping the \$9,000 in mind as to what other things can be funded. He adds that since they are looking at purchasing a variety of items they can get \$1,000 worth at a time.

Justin Ross asks if \$2,000 over a two year basis will still be beneficial. Keller Coker responds that they will make partial funding work. Robin Perkins notes that he was previously apprehensive because of the dollar amount but is more comfortable with a partial funding.

The motion passes 6-2-0.

Creative Arts – Funds for student pay

Jacob Marsh notes that it would make sense to grant some student wages since they just partially funded the equipment and it may require more students to put the shows on.

Caleb Tingstad would be ok funding at 50%.

Justin Ross notes that the dollar amount on the enhancement requests is \$1000 but it is listed as \$1,020 on the screen.

Keller Coker notes that the request has been made in previous years because the need has been there for several years. Jacob Marsh asks if partial funding would help. Keller Coker notes they could make it work.

Jenesa Ross questions why the Committee is handing out enhancements when they went through and made cuts. Carter Craig notes that there are \$9,000 dollars that could be spent or not without affecting the fee. That being said they are looking to allocate them towards something as opposed to going back through some of the budgets. Jenesa Ross notes that most area heads would prefer their base allocations instead. Patrick Moser notes that he would rather have funding in his base but notes that in an enhancement the Committee has the unique opportunity to allocate funds for a specific purpose for one fiscal period.

Tom Peterson encourages the Committee to move forward.

Jacob marsh moves to allocate \$500 plus the applicable administrative overhead to the request. Shannon Ross seconds.

Discussion

Jacob Marsh thinks the funds will be well utilized and asks for additional Committee input.

Shannon Hass reiterates that she had no intention of funding enhancements from the beginning.

Lexie Widmer would not be in favor of funding the enhancement since they just cut their base budget and would essentially be allocating funds back into it.

The motion is a ties 4-4-0.

Tom Peterson, IFC Chair, is opposed because he thinks the funds could be better utilized and other student wages have been cut during the base budget process.

The motion fails 5-0-0.

Athletics – Official fees

Shannon Haas asks what not funding the enhancement would mean to the department. Glen Harris notes that they have already received a base budget cut but would have to find the funds somewhere as the fees need to be paid one way or the other.

Caleb Tingstad and Carter Craig would be in favor of funding. Jacob Marsh would be in favor of partially funding because the fees are imposed upon them. Robin Perkins agrees with Jacob.

Justin Ross notes that the travel enhancement is also something that is needed because Concordia is joining the conference. He questions the difference that and funding the officials. Carter Craig responds that for him the difference is in the dollar amount associated with the requests. Shannon Haas notes that for her it is due to the official fees corresponding to home games. Justin Ross asks Glen if the funds could potentially be reallocated to travel after one year. Glen Harris responds that it would depend on conference schedules and travel needs.

Trey Shimabukuro would be ok with partially funding but is unsure to what extent. Carter Craig suggest funding it at 50%.

Shannon Haas would be ok with 50%.

Justin Ross notes that they previously cut Athletics about 2% which probably included some of the funds needed to pay officials and are now looking to add about \$3,000 to a specific line item. Lexie Widmer agrees with Justin.

Caleb Tingstad moves to fund the request at 50% with the applicable overhead. Trey Shimabukuro seconds.

Discussion

Jacob Marsh is confused because he thought that enhancements were meant to be in addition to what is in their base budget.

Justin Ross notes that they gave Athletics a 2% cut and Barb and Glen will be tasked with reallocating their current funds. With an enhancement their hands are tied because they cannot be reallocated for a fiscal year.

Carter Craig notes that the official fees are a need so it weakens the argument that the funds could be used in a different part of the budget.

The motion passes 6-2-0.

Athletics – Recovery System

Tom Peterson asks for a summary of the enhancement. Glen Harris provides a quick description of its purpose; quicker recovery times for injured students.

Justin Ross and Trey Shimabukuro expand on the description. Trey Shimabukuro adds that most schools have something similar.

Shannon Haas is opposed to funding.

Robin Perkins asks if Athletics does not already have something similar. Trey Shimabukuro notes that they do not have anything other than the traditional wrapping ice packs around the injury.

Lexie Widmer notes that the request is for one system and asks if one person at a time can use it. She also asks how many student athletes are typically injured at the same time. Glen Harris notes that it is his understanding that it would be one user at a time. Randi Lydum notes that there could be a schedule component to ensure that all the student athletes who need it are able to utilize it.

Tom Peterson asks how long a typical treatment plan could be take. Caleb Tingstad notes that it would probably be needed about once a day for a week for an injury that would typically linger for 3 to 4 weeks.

Justin Ross does not think that the potential timeframes are significant for the Committees' purpose. He also adds that during Subcommittee time Barb notes that this enhancement was one of the least priority. Trey Shimabukuro notes that he had put it at the top of his list because it is geared towards student health.

Caleb Tingstad reminds the Committee that it is a onetime enhancement.

Shannon Haas moves to fully fund the recovery system enhancement. Trey Shimabukuro seconds.

Discussion

Caleb Tingstad acknowledges that it is a difficult to understand enhancement but that the system will definitely help with student athlete recovery.

Shannon Haas agrees with what Caleb but at the same time would have preferred to give Athletics money in different ways as opposed to an enhancement.

Justin Ross understands the importance of the equipment but is unsure about having the entire student body to pay for one piece of equipment that will only be utilized by the 329 student athletes and 18 cheerleaders.

Carter Craig thinks it is a great tool in regards to health and a recruitment tool but not a necessary tool.

The motion fails 2-6-0.

Justin Ross notes that he understand the importance of Rip's personnel request and that it has been presented more than once. He wished there was a way to fund it this year but he doesn't see it happening due to the economic climate.

Werner University Center – Wolfie Program

Justin Ross thinks it's a great request and is in favor of having Wolfie have a consistent persona.

Jacob Marsh notes he was not previously in favor of the enhancement but has changed his mind and would be in favor.

Carter Craig notes that he thinks the new Wolfie will grow on the community in the same way it has grown on Jacob and goes towards cultivating a brand.

Shannon Haas agrees and notes that Wolfie was recently at the Capitol for University Day and thought that was great.

Justin Ross moves to fully fund the Wolfie program with the applicable overhead. Caleb Tingstad seconds.

Discussion

Shannon Haas agrees.

Lexie Widmer asks if Wolfie will be rented out. Patrick Moser responds that Athletics pays for their events. The requested funds will be utilized for other on campus and IFC events. If an area is unable to provide a handler then there will be a fee to provide one.

The motion passes 7-1-0.

Summer

Justin Ross asks if the Committee liked the summer budgets as they were provided. Caleb Tingstad is ok with the summer budgets that were presented. Lexie Widmer is in favor fully funding the summer budgets because it is her understanding that they are already as stripped down as possible and there is still a summer community they need to serve.

Jacob Marsh agrees.

Justin Ross moves to grant the Summer FY18 request as presented; \$32,356 for Creative Arts, \$8,666 for Childcare, \$63,655 for Health & Wellness Center, \$15,770 Student Leadership & Activities, and \$12,511 for the Werner University Center for a total of \$132,958, with a \$12 increase. Caleb Tingstad seconds.

Discussion

Carter Craig notes that the summer fee is already significantly lower and is a one-time fee as opposed to considering for 3 terms.

Robin Perkins notes that the fee is only paid by those students who are taking summer courses.

Darin Silbernagel notes that one of the differences is that during summer the whole fee is paid at credit one.

Justin Ross agrees with what has already been stated.

Jenesa Ross notes that the Committee has not asked about the enrollment decline in regards to the summer budgets.

Justin Ross responds that there is the hope that enrollment will increase and in the case of summer budgets there is not really anything extra that could be cut.

Jenesa Ross notes that she does not think that summer budgets are ever really analyzed because they are looked at last.

The motion passes 7-1-0.

Justin Ross moves to approve the preliminary decision setting the following budgets;

Abby's House at \$6,598

Access at \$24,744

ASWOU at \$290,699

Creative Arts at \$315,184

Athletics at \$1,290,000

Childcare at \$57,567

Extraordinary Travel at \$5,000

Student Media at \$153,960

Wellness Center at \$918,805

Club Sports at \$49,018

Intramurals at \$41,330

SLA at \$285,813
SLA-SAB at \$59,596
WOLF Ride at \$29,640
SLCD at \$7,646
WUC at \$949,920
Computer Replacement Reserve at \$30,500

For a subtotal of \$4,373,858 with a \$13 increase for the academic year.

Enhancements
ASWOU - \$376
Creative Arts - \$1,074
Athletics - \$3,327
WUC - \$1,990

For an enhancement subtotal of \$6,767

Setting the grand total of the fee at \$4,380,625 with a \$13 increase to the fee.
Shannon Haas seconds.

Discussion
Shannon Haas shares that her notes indicate that Access should be funded at \$24,583 as opposed to the \$24,744 listed.

Justin Ross moves to amend the motion to set Access at the correct amount of \$24,583. Carter Craig seconds. The amendment passes 8-0-0.

The motion passes 8-0-0.

7. Announcements

Justin Ross notes that everyone received a tabling schedule. If there are any changes they should contact him or Adela, IFC Secretary.

Shannon Haas asks whether the tabling is for one week or two. Justin Ross explains that the schedule is the same for two weeks.

Robin Perkins asks where the tabling will occur. It is established that the table is located across from the Bookstore in the Werner University Center.

a. Open Hearing Upcoming

Tom Peterson reminds everyone that the first open hearing will be on Thursday at 5:30pm with sign is starting at 5:00pm.

8. Adjournment

~~Not present in the recording.~~ Caleb Tingstad moves to adjourn.
The meeting adjourns at 11:46pm

