Welcome

President Nathan Rawlings: Welcome everyone. I want to acknowledge and thank Dr. James Morales for coming. Taylor Adams as well. Also Kevin Hurst in Price. Sione is the Student Body President in Price. We are happy to have him as well. Let me also acknowledge Crissy. She will be covering some good information and we really appreciate the work she did ahead of time and the presentation that she will give here. We are lax on the Roberts Rules of Order we will be casual with this. This meeting is open to the general public. If any non-committee members are present we welcome them as well. We encourage you to keep your microphones mutes unless you are speaking. A little adjustment to the agenda, I would like give Taylor a minute to go over some of the changes that maybe we need to consider better for next year and some of the lead up meeting we have preparing for this Fee Board, we didn’t incorporate Price as neatly as we could have. That is something that will be corrected for next year, and corrected this year because they are here now. Taylor will help us understand how the system is affected by individual changes. Then after Kaitlyn and Leahra talk about their proposals we want to give a minute to Crissy to present an idea that came as the executive council was in a meeting we were grasping for straws on how we could maybe have some more flexibility on the activity fee and how it’s distributed in general. Crissy has come up with an excellent idea and we want to give her the opportunity to look at that. With that I will turn the time over to Taylor.

Taylor Adams: I want to take everyone back quickly in the history. Some of you have been around for a while but when we first started out in student fees for Statewide Campuses which at the time was Regional Campuses we had this process by which each region would review the fees and we would take it to our executive council board and the administrative council which is with associate vice presidents and directors of students. And from there we took it to Fee Board and everyone knew what was happening. Last year a lot of you will remember that we made a change to the fee board policy. And that change was to allow us to better incorporate Price into this. So USU Eastern as well as Blanding into our overall fee structure. So making sure that the students in all regions outside of Logan were paying the same total amount of student fees. And then allowing the non-residential campuses and then Price and Blanding to adjust the total fee amount. In doing that we realized over the past few weeks we need to work on how this information gets to different groups. There were two suggestions that were brought forward for fees that we will learn about later tonight. And we took those suggestions to the Executive Council, which currently excludes Price. We talked it through and talked about data we needed and coordinated with Crissy. And then we got to this place where we realized, but wait, some of these changes could impact the non-residential statewide, the old regional campuses, differently than Price and Blanding. And so we realized that next year when we do this we really need to figure out the communication channels. We talked about how could we do this better for the next year. Sometimes with change you realize we didn’t hit that right on the spot with the communication to all of the groups. In the next iteration of this fee cycle, what we had anticipated is that because of how the student fees policy is written, Price and Blanding when they have their regional fee committees, anything they do can go straight to the Fee Board. We already know that whatever they decide in their meetings, we know those two things need to go straight to the fee board. Statewide non-residential campuses are a little bit different because we lump you all together as one unit. If Kaitlyn suggests a decrease to the building fee she needs to take that first to the small non-residential group and they need to decide what they are bringing to Fee Board. This time we skipped that statewide step and we’re bringing everything to Fee Board to discuss, but in the future we can streamline our communication, add in some meetings and different layers. It’s not that we aren’t doing it the right way, we just know that we can do it better so that more people are in the loop and know the process moving forward.
Nathan Rawlings: We will now move to Kaitlyn Buckner from the Uintah Campus and she now has some information and a proposal on a building fee decrease.

BUILDING DECREASE PRESENTATION

Kaitlyn Buckner: So first a little bit of background as to why we chose a decrease. Going into the fee board with my campus we said that we wanted to decrease something to make a difference and listen to the student voice. We went in saying we wanted to decrease something and we chose the building. We felt that the building was one that made the most sense. As we were looking at all of the fees and usage for a couple years we saw it’s not always used all the way. But sometimes it is. Sometimes large amounts are used. And sometimes not very much is used and we at the Uintah Basin don’t seem to use it a ton. We just felt like that was a fee that we could decrease. Having said that we were thinking the 10% decrease would be $8.67. I have no clue where we got that number then. Sophia has explained that we couldn’t just decrease that since that would take out USU Eastern’s category altogether since they only pay about $7. So we talked about how they could choose a different fee category. So that’s the background on where we were coming from. We just felt like this was a good area to decrease.

Nathan Rawlings: Thank you for that. There are some other issues to consider. Crissy does have some information that will be pertinent to that discussion and could potentially add a layer of difficulty to lowering a building fee. We appreciate you and your group trying to lower those fees. Every student wants lower fees and it’s great representation for them for you bring this forward to us.

Kaitlyn Buckner: In our own regional fee board we talked about the odds of having a decrease go through statewide is not likely, and we understand if something like this couldn’t happen but we mostly want to get our voice out there. Last year we did choose to do a decrease in one area and an increase in the other area and we just wanted to get our voices out there.

Nathan Rawlings: Thank you so much. Next up we have Leahra, and she represents the Southwest region. She would like to discuss the potential for an activity fee increase.

ACTIVITY FEE INCREASE PRESENTATION

Leahra Fernandez: Hi, thank you so much Nathan. Like Nathan said, we in our Southwest meeting talked about an activity fee increase. And this happened because our students were wondering why we would increase an activity fee. They weren’t sure how that would benefit them. I gave them the example of what Brigham did with the Hydro Flasks that were engraved and sent out to students. And the students were so excited and amazed that that’s something student government could do for them and we didn’t know students could receive a prize by that. This is not urgent by any means, but they were excited that if we increased the fee by 50 cents to a dollar we would have more money to send them a prize. It’s more about showing appreciation for them and building more of a community. Our centers are so spread out from Nephi to St. George that we really can’t get together. If we were able to send out something to unify all of them it would be a great effort to make them realize that they are part of the community. It isn’t urgent but I would like to see something happen in the next couple years if not this year. I told them with Covid it might not be the year, but this is what the students in the Southwest are thinking and that they would be excited to have something that would be kind of a pick me up.
Nathan Rawlings: Leahra did a great job representing her region. In the discussions leading up to this meeting it became apparent that there’s a big disparity between some campuses and others. We have rich campuses and poor campuses and we thought wouldn’t it be great to have some more flexibility and as a group we thought that that would be great. I talked to Sophie about reaching out to Crissy and getting some information there. I think what Crissy came up with is excellent. I will now turn the time over to her to talk about the broader effects of changing building fees as well as going into details about a potential fix to make the activity fee more equitable.

DISCUSSION/VOTE

Crissy Downs Cisneros: Thank you Nate. First off I would like to say thank you to Kaitlyn and Leahra. It gets me excited to be able to come and tell a bit of what I do and hopefully help everyone understand how the finances of your student fees work better. So I think I will address the building fee first and then we can move on to the activity fee. The building fee you can definitely see from year to year there is money left over and you go what's up with that. What can I do with it? So I am going to share a 3 year summary that I think will summarize what you see with building fees and we can talk through that. So this is a summary and hopefully it's not too small. I went through and listed each center and over the last 3 years what we are looking at and what was brought in, spent and what was left at the end of the year. And as you can see some years when you look at 2017-2018 we had quite a few who ended up in the negative for that year. And you can see Wasatch had a huge expense. Over $400,000 that year. And if you look at the next year they weren’t all negative, but the rest had a bit left over. And last year we didn’t have any building projects and all of that was due to covid. It was a weird year. The great thing about the building fee is it does have the ability that we can save up for certain projects. The Wasatch project for example that was $400,000, that wasn’t something that they did in just one year. That was a continual phasing each year that made it possible for them to get in their new building and make sure they had nice furniture in the student area. A lot of these different projects when you look at it you think wow $32,000 is a lot of money, and it is, I’m not downplaying that, but when you look at what it costs for projects they are really expensive. We have one campus that is looking at soundproofing a room for the counseling and psychological services appointments for students and it’s going to cost $40,000 to $50,000 to do that. So when we are talking about the building fees projects are really expensive. It takes two to four years to build up. You can see some landscaping projects that were around $80,000 to $90,000. There are lots of different areas. I wanted to put that out when we look at a year snapshot or two you can see that things are left over, but then you also have the ability to see that sometimes we are saving up for bigger projects. I would encourage people to become actively involved in projects and bring forth some ideas that you would like to see happening at your centers or things you think would be helpful for the students to have. Any questions?

Haley Rice: So you said that lots of money is held over for the next year. Is that the money moved into holding? Is that what we’re seeing?

Crissy Downs Cisneros: Yes there’s a holding account. And in past years it was also moved into what we call plant funds. That means a building savings account. Right now what we would do is at the end of each year we would move it into a holding account and we let it grow and then say ok we want to remodel this part of our building or expand our exercise area, or let’s buy new furniture. You can work with your AVPs and your Director of Students on some of those ideas, and we can see what we can work into the budget and see what funds are available. That’s what we want to see happening with those building funds.
Nathan Rawlings: Crissy I can’t remember where I heard this but something to the effect that if these accounts are sitting at 0 and we need to obtain a bond or something similar for really big projects. For starters they broke ground to create a whole new building in Moab. This could also affect our ability to fund bonds right?

Crissy Downs Cisneros: Absolutely right Nate you are correct. The building fee that is identified specifically for building. The controller’s office watches that very closely and it is used for USUs bond rating for big projects. So if we decrease that fee, that is going to affect that. We can talk about it here and see if we wanted to push the decrease, the likelihood of that making it all the way through is so unlikely because it is tied to USU’s bond rating. It has an affect outside of what we are seeing even in our world. Any other questions?

Kelsey Johnson: I really like this table. It helps put things into perspective. I think a lot better than just looking at one year. This is very helpful. I appreciate this.

Crissy Downs Cisneros: Absolutely. And just so you know if you ever have any questions about student fees, not even at review time, always feel free to reach out to me and I am happy to spend some time with you and explain things. I want to put that offer out there

Karlin Bauman: This is probably a question that I should have asked a long time ago. I don’t understand. As I understand it the campus directors have a building budget that they use and then we also have our student fees building fund. And I don’t understand why two different funds exist and how student fees got involved in those types of projects in the first place.

Crissy Downs Cisneros: When you’re thinking about the different directors, they do have a building fund, but those are the ones more about keeping things maintained, and for keeping the lights on and the operation for the building. A lot of times when the state of Utah requires buildings they put forth operation and maintenance index that has funds that have been set aside by the state of Utah to help for operation and maintenance which is now under ownership of Utah. The student fee one came into effect because there are sometimes things beyond what we can cover. Statewide Campuses as a whole does not get a lot of money in appropriation compared to some of the other areas. There was a need to be able to provide some buildings in areas for students and big expenses attached to that because it was all through distance. Basically we were starting from scratch. And that was years and years and years ago. That’s how it came about and it was part of that student fee because it enhanced the student experience. Similar to the instructional and student support. That is a high amount for the distance ed students because it is providing a lot of those services that make it so you can receive services where you are at as opposed to going to main campus. And I am happy to go back and see. That is what I’ve been told. I wasn’t around when this was originally set up, but I am happy to ask more questions for you and get more details on specific projects or what originally established that building fee.

Karlin Bauman: Thank you. I don’t know if that will be necessary but I’ve had a few conversations with our director who is very eager too encourage us to use the building fees for some projects around the building that in my mind, I don’t see the connection between these projects and the student fees. I don’t feel that the students are going to see or feel a real improvement in their experience at the campus. So I’ve been curious and wondering about that. So I have put a hold on any thoughts of doing any big projects because I feel like it is tone deaf to do something right now when students are struggling. When students are struggling to pay for school and to pay their fees I don’t feel good about spending a lot of that building fund. I don’t feel good about it. That’s where I have stood on that. But that is helpful too. I have wondered
why they can’t use their own money.

**Crissy Downs Cisneros**: It’s good that they have a good student advocating for them.

**Karlin Bauman**: WE have a beautiful new building. It’s gorgeous but I don’t think it need anything right now. Down the road that might change.

**James Morales**: Karlin and Kelsey, Kelsey made a comment in the chat. I think that is really important to consider timing. Some of these projects. There is a right time for using this building money for the purpose that it’s been designated for as opposed to the other building money that the director has that as Crissy explained is taking care of repairs and maintenance and utilities. An example that I can refer to in terms of the distinction between the two funds is, on the Logan Campus a couple years back we wanted to improve the seating on the 3rd level of the Taggart Student Center. Because there weren’t enough places for students to hang out and to study. So using your building funds, the ones that are collected in this account to pay for the booths that we put on the floor, that would be an appropriate use of that because it has direct benefits to the students. And the students wanted that. We learned through the leaders that students wanted those spaces. As opposed to let’s say the outside stairs of the TSC were beginning to crumble, which frankly they were, then there’s the other building fund that for example that would be the equivalent of your directors fund. That would be used to replace or to improve those aging staircases on the outside of the building. That is how I see the difference between the two. If you keep that in mind I think it makes sense in terms of that distinction. I wanted to go back to the discussion and point that Nate brought up and that Crissy weighed in on. I am concerned about the impact that reducing this fee would have on the bond rating capacity of the campuses. Crissy is there any way for us to calculate or estimate what impact that would be if we were to approve this requested reduction. I am concerned about having that kind of impact.

**Crissy Downs Cisneros**: When this was brought up I reached out to the controller’s office to say this is being discussed. What would this look like? They came back and said we would hate to see that happen. I can definitely go back and ask them what kind of impact that would have, but it made them nervous, like that’s something we don’t want to mess with. We have bonds that are on a 30-year bond type of thing. And when you start reducing those things included in that bond rating it can get a little bit messy for them. It would have a big impact. I don’t know the total impact but I am more than happy to reach out again and ask what the worst case would be. They were pretty much like we don’t know if we can do that.

**James Morales**: That’s good to know. Thanks for the clarification. Kaitlyn, I really appreciated how you said at the beginning of your presentation how your group went into this with the idea of let’s reduce something. I think that’s a commendable approach. By the way on the Logan campus we are reducing one of our fees for the first time in the 12 years that I’ve been here to see that happen. But they did choose a fee that wouldn’t have this kind of impact on a significant area of the university. Just something to consider.

**Kaitlyn Buckner**: Just out of curiosity what did they choose to decrease?

**James Morales**: We voted, via straw poll, the final vote is next week, but we voted to reduce the technology fee. The fee goes in large part to support the computer labs on the Logan campus and one of the labs in Old Main over the last ten years we have seen decreasing usage by students every year of that particular lab. They are using computer labs that are more accessible and have more of a software that they want in the Engineering Building and the TSC. So they actually are going to close down the lab in Old
Main so there is less need for hardware and software because there will be one less lab. So we decided that we can reduce that fee because the lab wouldn’t be operational anymore. And again it seemed like a really appropriate reduction right now rather than just to keep it or redirect it somewhere else.

**Crissy Downs Cisneros:** Any other questions about the building fee before I move on to the idea for the activity fee I would like to present? Can everyone see the new sheet? Perfect. So as Nate has said they came with this concern about how there was such a disparity when we are looking at the activity fee. And students in some of these areas were able to get some of these nice swag items so to speak where students in other areas couldn’t. As I looked at this fee and worked more with it over the years what I noticed was the biggest issue was your guys’ USUSA scholarships. Centers that had few students and didn’t have a very large activity budget to begin with were having to take the whole cost of that scholarship and it drained their account right from the beginning and left them with hardly anything to use for actual activities. So as I got thinking, we have Nate’s president scholarship that we allocate based on the FTE of the students. It’s awarded out of Logan and we spread that on a pro-rated share. We spread that out based on that pro-rated share. So my thought was what if we do something similar with all of the USUSA scholarships for the non-residential campuses. I will walk you through what I have on my sheet here. I just did a summary for Fall semester so we can see what it is. Here is the activity fee revenue, again for non-residential campuses, and we have that amount that came in for fall semester. We have the scholarships that were awarded for fall semester, and this is just the one semester so you would see that exact same dollar amount for spring. Then we have what was allocated for Nate’s scholarship for fall, and that left us with the remaining activity fee balance. Then I thought ok let’s just drop in the fall FTE and the fall headcount to see what that gives us. Taking what the remaining balance was I divided it by the fall FTE and as you can see us that gave us a remaining amount per FTE, meaning full time enrollment equivalent. As you can see, Moab, one of our smaller centers that has $8.48 left for each of their full-time enrolled students. It gets even less if you look at their headcount. And as you can see it’s a big range. We have $8 per student, then we go up to $32.84 for our bigger centers. I said ok how does that work with headcount and it skewed things. If we have one student that drives across the mountain to Brigham to take one class they are counted in the headcount. They are just popping over for a course and then popping back to Logan. I thought headcount skewed things. Doing it that way Brigham City went from being one of the higher ones to one of the lower ones. It just means students are potentially coming and taking a class so they’re getting counted once but it’s not a whole lot. So I like the FTE number a bit.

Then I said ok I am going to take that FTE headcount and spread it across the scholarships based on the fall FTE just like we did for Nate’s scholarship. So I did the exact same thing. Now you can see the numbers start to change. Suddenly our range is no longer $8 up to $32. But it has shifted a bit and we have more, especially if looking at Moab they went from $8 per student to $23. And I presented it to Nate this morning and he said is there a way we could just split that scholarship and come to the remaining amount and make it universal? So I said let’s try that. I figured out what that universal amount would be, which is $29.54. If we wanted to come back to that number, this is how we would have to spread the scholarships and that would give everyone the same per FTE amount. If you look at Moab they suddenly went from having $605.00 up to $2,112.00. If you look at Southwest they went from $3200 and now they have $1300 more they can use to possibly help. This is the idea to not to anything with the overall activity fee but maybe there is something we can do with the scholarship. It’s such a large amount and a large hit to some of those smaller budgets so maybe there’s something we can do with that to even the playing field and give the opportunity to those other campuses or centers to be able to afford those items that Leahra was mentioning. Any thoughts or questions?
Kelsey Johnson: So just to clear this up, we currently do not have scholarships using FTE?

Crissy Downs Cisneros: Not for the vice president and reps. Those are paid by the center where they are located. Nate’s scholarship is split on a pro-rated basis.

Kelsey Johnson: Ok so blue table is what's currently happening. Yellow and red are ideas.

Crissy Downs Cisneros: Correct.

Taylor Adams: I think that this is great, Nate, and I remember Kelsey talking about this. But it makes me think of some equity gaps that we might be closing. Especially for students in rural Utah. Right now they don’t get the same level of support that we have in urban areas because of the amount of students that are at those locations. Our student officers are allowed to do some really awesome things for them and help them feel connected in ways that our rural students don’t get to experience because they just don’t have the amount of students. Kudos to the students for thinking of this idea and to Crissy for coming up with this. I think this is awesome.

Kaitlyn Buckner: I had a couple of questions, because in some of our meetings we were talking about different positions and how students from the statewide campus can run for other offices, so if we were to have those students from different offices, does that create problems? Would it create more scholarships. Do those come out of this? We also voted yesterday to change the Uintah Basin reps from 3 reps to 2. That would change this a bit too. It sounds in the next year we will have different officers and different scholarships.

Nathan Rawlings: One thing to point out right away, it’s obvious looking at these sheets. Price and Blanding sorry for making you sit through this. Your fees are different and your structure is different. If they ran for a student body position out of the whole system it wouldn’t come out of this. What it does do is spread that scholarship cost for ever region over all of this right. If a vice president came and said I wanted to add 3 more people to my team, then it would be a lot more likely that the group would say no because we’ve got to pitch in on that. So go ahead and justify that to us. Where otherwise we wouldn’t be as concerned. You brought the reduction of a representative to us last night and if you can do without it that’s great. If you think it’s a great choice we will support you. Whereas this would have us be more actively involved in that. We would have been lobbying big time if we were the ones chipping in. If we were to adopt this, the reduction in scholarship cost that you made last night would be a benefit to all of us.

Karlin Bauman: I’m thinking of some of the ideas that Kelsey had where she wants to add someone and feels like she needs to add someone that is also going to affect us as well, right Kelsey?

Kelsey Johnson: Sounds like it.

Karlin Bauman: Yes.

Nathan Rawlings: It will but it is proportionate to the population of full-time students, right? So you look at this change and you look at the increase for Moab to go from $600 to $2,000. That’s huge for them. But the $600 maybe isn’t that impactful to Wasatch or to Brigham. It being proportionate really helps soften the blows to those bigger campuses. It really does help the smaller rural campuses.

Sophia May: I will speak to your concern about your concern with the new structure that was brought up.
If it passes and goes into play not this year but next year, those executive leadership positions, the big three, the positions that anyone could run for, it is my understanding that those would be funded centrally so that wouldn’t affect your budgets in any way.

**Crissy Downs Cisneros**: Also just to clarify, does everyone know what FTE means? FTE is a full-time enrollment equivalent. So not just on here’s a student. They take the total number of credits generated at that center and they approximate that many credits. It divides that by the total number of credits and says basically you have an equivalent of this many full-time students, so it’s a way to even out. You can see the headcount can be very misleading whereas the FTE levels it out based on a universal comparison across the board.

**Nathan Rawlings**: I think it’s remarkable to have a proposal like this where we have one group that wants to decrease acknowledging, hey we have a little more money than we need. Followed by another student that says we are broke down here. I really like this proposal. The other thing that I think it helps us do, is if not this year, but maybe going forward. If each campus is looking at the same set of numbers to spend per student, maybe it helps us feel more comfortable as a group to want to raise or lower this. Because we are all seeing the same sort of reality on the ground. We would all see that together, whereas now you’re going to have opposing views because it’s so different for each campus.

**Crissy Downs Cisneros**: Any other thoughts or questions? I agree with Nate that it really levels things out and makes a good playing field for everyone. It also has a self check built in. If enrollments go up you end up with more money because it’s based on that FTE. It does tie it and make it fair across the board. That is all I have as far as things to present.

**Karlin Bauman**: I have one more question. In previous meetings we were talking about the issue of inequity and the fact that some students get nicer swag items, or items at all, and others don’t. We talked about possibly getting together and doing it all together like a big order for everyone. I’m not sure if that would be possible as far as the way the accounts are set up. We have to be very careful to make sure that the things we give out have the Salt Lake Campus or the Orem Campus logos on them, so maybe this isn’t the right time to bring this up. I’m just wondering if there’s anything that prevents us from pooling our resources. If everyone wants a water bottle is there anything that would prevent us from doing that.

**Crissy Downs Cisneros**: Absolutely not. You could do a big order and we would split up the cost of that order based on the indexes of how many items you gave away at your campuses. We would just split the invoice against all of the other activity invoices.

**Karlin Bauman**: We were thinking well if a couple campuses didn’t have the amount of money needed to cover those invoices, but if we created a fund that everyone could use? Like we could all contribute to this fund, and even those campuses that wouldn’t be able to handle the invoices could still be able to get that item?

**Crissy Downs Cisneros**: That makes sense. So if the rich campuses want to help some of the poor campuses to create that unity. Absolutely, we could talk about different ways of doing that. Is there anyone that has extra budget in their money to contribute to this project so that everyone could do it I think it would be something we would handle on a case by case basis to allow the campuses to say they could do that. My hope would be is if we do something like this we would have less of that happening where there wouldn’t be a campus that didn’t have enough money.
Taylor Adams: I agree. I feel like it overcomes that barrier. That was a strategic way, Karlin, to say how could we make that equal. And then Haley gets to decide what Moab gets because maybe she doesn’t want to give them blankets but the Southwest does. Whatever it may be I think it helps so that people can afford what they want. And if it doesn’t in a year then we come back to this same space and say well that didn’t go as planned so maybe we need to figure out a solution. But I think this is a good solution to make.

Karlin Bauman: I would agree with that and I appreciate movement toward equity. I didn’t realize what a struggle it was for other campuses and it took too long for me to figure that out. I really like the idea of evening things out.

Crissy Downs Cisneros: Is there one method you prefer over the other? We just use the universal amount or just use the FTE on a pro-rated basis which still gives us a range, but it levels the playing field. There are two options out there. I didn’t know if you had one way or the other on how you would prefer we do it.

Karlin Bauman: I would prefer the second option. And I can’t remember what that’s called.

Crissy Downs Cisneros: The one in the yellow has it split by FTE so you can see it levels it out but it still has a range from 23 to 35. And the bottom one is where we figure out and say ok this is how much we have left over based on our overall FTE so we take our total remaining balance and it’s $29.54 and you basically spread it out so it takes us back to that number so everyone has the exact same number as the end. It’s backing into that scholarship amount so everyone has a universal number.

Kaitlyn Buckner: I like the bottom one also. My only concern is every campus with the remaining activity balance is higher on the bottom one except for Uintah Basin where we lose $2,000. I’m trying to see why.

Kelsey Johnson: We are losing some in Brigham too.

Taylor Adams: Could it be because of the population headcount versus FTE? So Brigham you are getting fees for students traveling over the mountain. The basin I am unsure about but Crissy could probably explain that better.

Crissy Downs Cisneros: So any of the larger campuses are going to lose in this scenario. Brigham City, Uintah Basin, Wasatch. Those are the ones you are going to see losing the funds because they are the ones that had a larger pool of money. So their amount that was left over when we do the scholarships based on how it is right now, they have more money left over because they have more students. When we try to level that out those are the ones that ended up losing. The others can have theirs brought up. So it’s taking the ones that have a lot of students and evening it out so the ones that don’t have as many students still have more money. It’s not evening the total money out, it’s just making it the same for fulltime enrollment equivalent.

Kaitlyn Buckner: From the blue to the yellow Uintah Basin goes up, but yes it was from yellow to orange that I noticed we went down. I was confused but that makes sense.

Crissy Downs Cisneros: You can see that Wasatch also went down. Again it’s that difference that anyone that was above $29 in the yellow will be less as we move it into the orange because we are trying to find the average number. If you are above average you are going to go down, and if you are below average you’re going to come up. There isn’t a rhyme or reason in the orange. The orange is we are just finding
the average number of the overall FTE across the campuses and backing into it.

**Nathan Rawlings:** My thought is if you are leaning towards the bottom one. But the other way to consider it is do we think that a smaller regions vice president should get a smaller scholarship? I think we would definitely say no. Of course not. But when you think about it that way it gives it a stark contrast. They are doing the same activities and the same things but they have a smaller number of students to support that scholarship. So the only way to pay that same scholarship amount without taking it away from the students in that area is to spread it out among all the campuses. That way any region, the scholarship number is the same but that’s not affecting the students in that region.

**Sophia May:** I am curious to hear what Dr. Morales’ thoughts are on this.

**James Morales:** I think they are both moves in the right direction. Back to the idea of trying to be as equitable as possible, the universal one seems to be the one I would favor, but again I don’t want to put too much of my opinion on this. The students should drive this and do what they feel most comfortable with. But I think either of those are a move in the right direction.

**Kelsey Johnson:** If you compare Blue to Yellow and Orange, Brigham Kaysville and Wasatch all lose money in either option, and everyone gains money. I get to vote for Brigham and Kaysville and between the yellow option and the orange option, one campus would have more money in the orange option, and my other campus would have more money in the yellow option, just to point that out. If I represented other campuses I think I would be more in favor of this, but because of that difference there it’s so different for both campuses that I represent. I think they are great ideas but it is difficult for me to say which one is better for my vote. Are we going to vote on this tonight?

**Nathan Rawlings:** I would recommend we put it to a vote. We may as well see where everyone stands on it. You are right. You don’t take a structure that has an impact on certain groups and correct that without it hurting other groups that are benefitting from the current system. If you are benefitting from the current system I can see the reluctance to have to say to students hey we are going to get a little less. The only thing I can say is look at what you still have left. There’s a great number of students that aren’t as active on bigger campuses. The smaller campuses have smaller groups that can be more active. More students that will respond to an email. I think in that respect its more impactful on those smaller campuses than the losses on the bigger campuses.

**Haley Rice:** Speaking for Moab, my question to you guys as bigger campuses. In previous years do you guys struggle to spend your budget? I guess that would be my first question. Is there ever a gap where you are trying to find something, or is it always pretty allocated out? I only ask because I am the small guy. Me and Leahra. And I wanted to know your thought on with the decrease how bad that would impact you guys. That would even sway how I vote.

**Kelsey Johnson:** Kaysville uses their budget every single year. They are really good about not going over budget. Brigham usually has a balance at the end of the year available that goes to their holding account. Kaysville breaks even, Brigham has extra, or at least has the year I have been here. And we have spent money out of that holding account on different things. It’s basically a savings account.

**Kaitlyn Buckner:** I don’t know if Uintah Basin is considered a big campus but we are bigger, and we always have some left over.
Karlin Bauman: As does Wasatch.

Nathan Rawlings: Hey Leahra, can you talk to us a bit about maybe the struggle it is for you to operate with the budget that you have? You are requesting an increase because you are struggling down there.

Leahra Fernandez: As a rep the previous year, and as a vice president this year, I feel like every time we meet, our director is telling us we don’t have enough money. We need to pick and choose. Do you want this or this? I am totally ok with being creative and coming up with solutions with the money we do have, but I want to voice what the students said. They said they would like some of these things that other students just a few hours away are getting. And I have always grown up in a small town and it is difficult to know that if you lived somewhere else you would be getting more. I do not want to affect the lives of the other students, and I was honestly thinking if we give more to the smaller campuses and they don’t use it or don’t participate, we can always adjust this. I don’t want it to feel like this is a permanent thing. But I do want to experiment with what can these smaller campuses do with more money. Is it maybe our turn to have the opportunity to do something special for our students? Those are my thoughts.

Kelsey Johnson: I have a request before this goes to vote. If you could remind us in a nutshell what we are voting for. We wouldn’t be voting to increase the fee right? Just distributing it differently? There might be more questions but I think recapping everything before we vote would be helpful.

Taylor Adams: I was thinking it would be very helpful for Nate or Sophie or Kevin Webb to chime in on what we can vote on, what needs a vote, and what needs to go where. We are looking at so many things at once and just lay out what we are voting on and who is voting on it and what else we need to do.

Sophia May: Kevin that was my question as well. Assuming that something like this does move forward, what is the process at that point. Kevin Webb if you would be willing to speak to that for a moment I would love that.

Kevin Webb: As far as I know there is nothing expressly enumerating authority to a body to adjust something like this. It’s never been done before. My personal sense would be if its affecting the individual budgets on each region then they should review it, and probably vote and that should be taken to EC and then a vote taken there. It’s not a Fee Board matter. It’s dealing with the activity fee money going to scholarships but nothing like this is addressed in the fee board policy at all.

Nathan Rawlings: So to answer part of your question, we are not looking at an increase or a decrease. We are looking for changing how we pay for scholarships. And spreading it across the statewide campuses evenly and getting an equal dollar amount per student to spend.

Sophia May: I’m wondering if at this point if the bodies support it would it be worth bringing it up in an Administrative Council meeting and taking to the AVPs and DOS’s and advisors and get that input as well? I’m not entirely positive what the best way to move forward would be. I think it’s worth exploring.

Karlin Bauman: We have to realize too that these numbers might not be the most accurate since we just voted to remove the position in the Uintah Basin. It probably won’t change a lot but the numbers aren’t totally accurate at this point right?

Nathan Rawlings: It would change a little bit, but my understanding is with a system like this you would run that calculation every fall and get distributed per FTE. Right now if you look at that $29.54 we just got rid of the $1000 scholarship that would just raise it by a couple dollars on each of those or something. So
do we just table this for this meeting?

**Sophia May:** Could it be a recommendation that the fee board makes? And then they pursue it with the Admin Council and their regions? What would make the most sense, Kevin?

**Kevin Webb:** EC is all here so recommending it to themselves doesn’t carry a ton of weight. There isn’t really a pro or con either way there.

**Sophia May:** So a resolution in Executive Council would be the approach?

**Kevin Webb:** I think it would just be a bill if you want to do legislation. It’s their money and their scholarships. I don’t know why they wouldn’t have the ability to reallocate it.

**Sophia May:** Great. Thanks.

**Nathan Rawlings:** Now I double apologize to Price and Blanding who had to sit through that when we will have to move it back to Executive Council. I like the thought process and the direction we are trying to take. Hopefully we can pursue it and get it to a time where we can review it. All the Vice Presidents please take that back to the students you represent and see what you think needs to happen. Encourage them to walk a mile in the other persons shoes. Right now in Moab she gets to spend $8.48 per student. That’s pretty awful. There is such a large gap there. It’s pretty stark. Anyway, so is there any discussion toward decreasing the building fee or increasing the activity fee? Maybe a better place to start is maybe Kaitlyn do you still want to move forward with a vote on a building fee decrease?

**Kaitlyn Buckner:** I think after talking about the building fee and the bonds and everything I think it is ok to vote on it, but I don’t think it will go anywhere.

**Sophia May:** As a clarification on voting too, it is my understanding that it would have to be a vote for the total fee amount. At that point the non-residential campuses would need to decide where they want that decrease to go, Blanding would need to decide where they want that to go, and then USU Eastern would also need to decide where they want that decrease to go. Is that correct?

**Crissy Downs Cisneros:** Yes. It has been brought forward by the non-residential campuses for the building fee, and then others like Price, they don’t even have $8 in their building fee. So if we decrease the overall fee they would have to go back and see in their areas where they would take that decrease from.

**Sophia May:** Sione and Kevin Hurst, I am curious, if a decrease was voted on and supported what are your thoughts on that? Is that something you would be supportive of?

**Sione Sadeki:** I think listening to these stories about other students throughout the system it is important that all students at USU feel that this is the right school for them. I am in favor of doing what we can for campuses that are not ours.

**Kevin Hurst:** Quick question. Since we don’t have the money to accommodate a building decrease, we could pick a different student fee?

**Sophia May:** That is exactly what you would have to do. You would have to choose where you want that decrease to be allocated.

**Kevin Hurst:** We could pick something out of our activity account or location?
Sophia May: Yes.

Kevin Hurst: Thank you. That helps.

Nathan Rawlings: Kaitlyn up to you. Do you want to vote or rescind?

Kaitlyn Buckner: If it’s not going to go anywhere I guess there’s no point in voting on it. I don’t know.

Karlin Bauman: Would your students be happy knowing that the redistribution of scholarship happens would it accomplish something they want?

Kaitlyn Buckner: I don’t know if I could speak to that. We do spend a good chunk of our fees on fun stuff.

Karlin Bauman: I was curious to know, or try to look at it in a different way. Maybe students want to reduce fees but them feeling like they’re getting more for their money if that would accomplish not the same thing, but would help them feel like their funds are being used. Sometimes people get wrapped up in the same way of thinking but we can look at it at a different angle.

Nathan Rawlings: Kaitlyn unless you feel strongly a way you are teetering enough I am going to say let’s put it to a vote. You were sent here with this proposal so let’s get a vote on it.

Kaitlyn Buckner: Can we use the amount I put on the Qualtrics survey?

Nathan Rawlings: Yes. And what was that amount Sophie?

Sophia May: It was $8.67

Kaitlyn Buckner: Let’s do it.

Karlin Bauman: This is the one that would affect the bond rating?

Nathan Rawlings: Yes. I would go by individual right? Ok so in favor would be to decrease the building fee by $8.67. If opposed, you want to leave the building fee alone.

Building Fee:

Yes: 1

No: 8

Abstain: 0

Status: Failed

Nathan Rawlings: Any other discussions or points on the activity fee before we vote on that?

Sophia May: I would again just clarify that if you vote for an increase in the activity it would still have to be an increase for the overall total at which point everyone would have to figure out and agree on where they want that increase to do. Blanding and USU Eastern would have to figure out where they want that to go.

Nathan Rawlings: Alright and Leahra what is the dollar amount there that you want?
Leahra Fernandez: Our increase was between 50 cents and $1. My question is if we are going to re-allocate like we saw on those graphs there wouldn’t be a need for an increase because it would solve my problem and Moab’s problem. Do we need to vote on this or do we move on and talk about reallocating the funds?

Nathan Rawlings: The only thing there is we can’t guarantee that that will pass. So we aren’t going to vote on reallocating the funds here. We will take that back to Executive Council and you guys in the meantime can talk to your representatives and we will come back together and that’s where that reallocation will be addressed. If you don’t want to vote on increasing the fee, there is no guarantee that you’ll get a reallocation later. If you want to rescind I’m find with that but just know that there’s no guarantee there. We would need to pick the amount and clarify how much you want to increase it.

Sophia May: And also as an additional point of information, if we did vote on that increase and it passed in this body, it would then go to President Cockett and the Board of Trustees as well. So this is a recommendation that would then be explored further.

Kelsey Johnson: Can we, and would it help if we did an unofficial vote on reallocating? Would that help?

Nathan Rawlings: If it’s within my authority I choose not to take a soft vote in this meeting. It’s meant for another group and it wouldn’t have any weight anyway. I would like to see each VP go back and talk to their reps before we do any sort of voting on it. Their input certainly needs to be considered. It’s not something we have talked about before tonight. The worst-case scenario would be that a soft vote would be misleading to what the end result is.

Kelsey Johnson: Good point, thank you.

Nathan Rawlings: Leahra what would you like to do?

Leahra Fernandez: Let’s vote on a 50 cent increase and see where everybody is at.

Nathan Rawlings: Ok. If you are for, then you are voting that you would like to see a 50 cent increase on the activity fee. If you are opposed, then you are saying that you would like to leave the activity fee right where it is.

Activity Fee

Yes: 5

No: 4

Abstain: 0

Status: Passed

Nathan Rawlings: What kind of a majority do we need?

Kevin Webb: It’s simple majority.

Nathan Rawlings: Ok so those who are for have the majority. That will be our recommendation to go forward as a 50 cent increase on the activity. Where do we take that from here?
Sophia May: At this point, we still have another Fee Board with Logan next week where they will make their final vote. At which point you can work with Lucas Stevens, the current Executive Vice President, on a letter that will be sent to President Cockett explain that you would like a 50-cent increase to the total fee amount. She will review that, the Board of Trustees will also view it, and then USU Eastern and Blanding would have to come together to decide exactly where that increase would get put.

Nathan Rawlings: I can’t thank Crissy enough for all of her hard work. Whether we make a change there or not it was worth considering and we appreciate her help. Thank you Taylor and Dr. Morales. The Kevins as well, thank you. Jessica has been quiet but thank you for sitting in as well. Sione hopefully I get to see you next week. With that I would love entertain a motion to adjourn.

Katilyn: Motioned

Kelsey: Seconded
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