University Budget Committee – Student Subcommittee

Meeting Agenda

March 6, 2015
3:44pm

Meeting Facilitator: David Teagle

Invitees: Antonio Jose Torres <ajtorres@my.uno.edu>; Brandon Durden <bdurden@my.uno.edu>; Brent J Polizzi <bjpolizzi@uno.edu>; Christie A Sukhdeo <csukhdeo@my.uno.edu>; Courtney Lynn Roblez <croblez@uno.edu>; Derreck Blake Deason <sgtreasurer@uno.edu>; Hunter Christian Christopher <hcchris1@my.uno.edu>; Joshua Earl Lambert <jelambe1@my.uno.edu>; Kyle James Putnam <kjputnam@my.uno.edu>; Langston Anthony Williams <lawill11@my.uno.edu>; Shawn Jeffery Waltz <sjwaltz@uno.edu>

I. Call to order – 3:44pm

II. Roll call – (see above: red = absent)

III. Approval of minutes from last meeting

IV. New Business
   a) Hunter – specific reason for individual fees?
      b) Learning Library – Fund the things we have already outlined and build it like the academics fee where we are allotted a certain fee. Allows for flexibility and more student control. Not give to departments; give to students.
   c) Shawn - all motions will have to go through the Senate? This will goes to the Senate and then is dispersed from there?
   d) Hunter - this is a better way to budget these projects. All needs will be different.
   e) Shawn – am only willing to take so much out of First Year Experience (FYE). There is value in the Privateer Camp.
   f) Hunter – not arguing the value of FYE. Is there value in investing in a department which will soon be dissolved (e.g. SIL)
   g) Shawn – heavier in FYE to indoctrinate students into UNO which will lend itself to Student Involvement Leadership (SIL).
   h) Hunter - whoever presents a better proposal will come to the Senate and receive the best funding.
   i) Shawn - not a Antonio on performance funding. Who comes to request the money? If we are looking at a SIL and FYU merger would the requests come from the budget committee?
   j) Hunter – the leader of nonacademic unit comes for the funds (i.e. the relevant faculty head of the faculty staff).
   k) Christy – that specific dollar amount goes to that specific category. If there is subcommittee who controls the money and one who doesn’t you are imposing a lot of bias.
   l) Hunter – cannot get rid of a program all together.
   m) Antonio – can only be reduced by 80%.
   n) Hunter – some things do stay on the budget forever (e.g. legal services). It is still up to students to decide what is relevant. Heavy redundancies in here; more policy vs fee side. Fair flexible, transparent, and student controlled.
   o) Brandon – keep funds from the fee?
   p) Hunter – Advocating to combine them. Do not want to keep money for things that aren’t working.
   q) Christy - the money does not just go through the dept. SG controls all the money? They still have to come to SG but SG can only give them $18,000 per year for $1.
Hunter – these multiple fees are a lot of committees. A better solution might be to create an infrastructure to support these and create policies for each while having reasons to allocate them to each. In addition, have loose flexibility to get rid of the fees.

Antonio – University of Louisiana system will not let student get rid of fees.

Shawn – is there a way to charge a fee? (e.g. scraping committee)

Hunter – it will get slashed into a service account.

Shawn – laws are similar to those of FL State. If we charge the fee it will go into a scraping account.

Hunter – it does not work that way in Louisiana.

Shawn – if it is, the laws need to change.

Hunter – one time expenditures.

Shawn – change the state laws?

Hunter - when merging together they will have a larger reserve account to move funds around.

Shawn - when the Senate writes a bill… rewrite it within the general ideas of what we have decided to keep this place going. Make sure it lands where it needs to go.

Christy – write a % that is equal to.

Josh – we can write a percentage that has to go towards something?

Hunter - will include all that in the constitution.

Antonio – approves of breaking down percentages to present to the Senate.

Shawn – the only problem is if they go way off base.

Should not vote to change the organization structure of the allocated funds to a percentage infrastructure because this is a guideline. This is a guiding document not a binding document.

Hunter – allows us to bring this up. It’s a marketing thing.

Motion to approve the policy change to remerge the maintenance and beautification fees but requiring that 10% is used for beautification purposes. Vote is unanimous.

Shawn – UNO is a division one. One would be hard-pressed to find a high research institution without athletics.

Brandon – are we getting that now?

Shawn - They give the money raised to the university from its tuition dollars and every student credit hour they get the state gives money to the University of Louisiana system (UL).

Brandon – same as giving a scholarship to another student?

Shawn - difference is the marketing, brand and entertainment. Someone might write a Antonio check and fund various things.

Brandon - do people take into account sports when they come to a school?

Antonio – it gets the university’s name out there.

Brandon - who is giving research dollars to institutions because of sports?

Hunter - could word it like 30% has to be spent on enrollment and retention projects or programming. Keep it broad.
t) Motion to merge the learning commons, SIL, FYE, and counseling fees into a single privateer experience fee with 30% reserved for the funding of enrollment and retention programs/program series, and projects. Call to vote: unanimous.

uu) Shawn - sports provides entertainment for alumni that live in New Orleans. With the fees structure currently being used we are setup to be a crutch for athletics.

vv) Antonio – Division one fairly new?

ww) Shawn – will they figure out how to support themselves? The fee is to give them time to figure out what they are going to do. When they went out of LSU and into UL they have had repeated budget cuts. Students will help out when they can.

xx) Hunter - what if the academic fee can be used to fund other athletics fees? Academic, debate, Mini Baha, etc.

yy) Antonio – then we can change the name of it.

zz) Hunter - this fee shall be used to budget for university recognized student organizations.

aaa) Antonio - if we write it up as something small percentage goes to? Prohibit that.

bbb) Brandon - SG could keep money instead of the fee completely disappearing?

ccc) Shawn - if it goes to the UL board what would their justification be to keep it? Dissolution of fee?

ddd) Hunter – it is a lot of money.

eee) Shawn – not for funding outside of athletics for athletics fee.

V. Open Forum

a) Athletic fee discussion.

b) Adjournment – Motion to adjourn. Second. 4:33pm