

Student Fee Committee

Meeting Agenda

Thursday, September 5, 2024

I. Call to Order

a. The meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m.

II. Roll Call

a. Sophia Nowers, SFC Chair

b. Saegis Abbott, Member-at-Large

c. Lillian Goodyear, Member-at-Large

d. Dylan Perfect, Member-at-Large

e. Connor Chen, Member-at-Large

f. Madison Wusstig, Member-at-Large

g. TBA, ASOSU Liaison

h. Lauren Camou, Basic Needs Center Liaison

i. Angelo Arredondo, Family Resource Center Liaison

j. Noah Roberts, Memorial Union Liaison

k. Oliver Devereux, Performing Arts Liaison

l. Emma Flick, Recreational Sports Liaison

m. Narmeen Rashid, Student Experiences & Engagement Liaison

III. Oath of Office for New Members

a. There were no new members to swear in.

IV. Approval of the Minutes

a. The minutes were approved as written.

V. Approval of the Agenda

a. The agenda was approved as written.

VI. Student Advisory Board Updates

a. ASOSU

i. There were no updates.

- b. BNC
 - i. **Lauren Camou:** We haven't had a follow up meeting, but there should be a meeting to establish the SAB very soon.
- c. FRC
 - i. **Angelo Arredondo:** We haven't met yet, so no updates.
- d. MU
 - i. **Noah Roberts:** SEE has requested that the GCK (Global Community Kitchen) be transferred from the SEE budget to the MU budget, under index MUNKIT. Employees of GCK will also have opportunities for additional hours, and the transfer for GCK's budget will be backdated to July 1st, meaning a decision package will not be required in this coming up fee setting process. Student groups will continue to have the same place in the GCK, and the space will also have the walk-in fridge that will be used by Basic Needs Center. MU presented a decision package last year to fund an equipment systems specialist position, and a candidate has been chosen. The MU was allocated 1.3 million dollars years ago, Deb (the MU director) has been working with architecture group, and the project is now officially developing. No additional decision packages will be needed for this project. SEC 112 was previously the pride center, but now there has been a space allocation request and discussions have taken place. This would likely be a short-term agreement, but more updates to come soon.
- e. Performing Arts
 - i. **Emma Flick:** Nothing new to report.
- f. Rec Sports
 - i. **Oliver Devereux:** No updates.
- g. SEE
 - i. **Narmeen Rashid:** Nothing new to report, we are meeting tomorrow but do not expect any changes.

VII. Old Business

a. *There was no old business*

VIII. New Business

a. Budget Rationale Document Discussion & Final Vote

- i. **Sophia Nowers:** No feedback on section 1. A small change in 1.4 on wording. Anyone have any opinions?
- ii. **Lilly Goodyear:** I am personally onboard with the new phrasing.
- iii. **Sophia Nowers:** 3.2 got some feedback on ways to rephrase this, any thoughts?
- iv. **Connor Chen:** I put this in, and I guess in this document there wasn't really that hard a question of if units could identify any inefficiencies. This was more of a thought, and I wanted to hear what people think.
- v. **Dylan Perfect:** I think that this is similar to a question that was submitted by the budgets committee. I think this could be getting at that in a way they would find helpful. I think also if I was a budget manager and was being asked if there were any inefficiencies, I would read that as asking if there were any areas that could be cut out of the budget, so I think we should rephrase it a bit. I do think it would be good to ask in the abstract some way.
- vi. **Noah Roberts:** I am following with Dylan; I think it is a good thing for us to try and evaluate the budgets to make sure they are being allocated responsibly. In this current wording, there may be a lot of tricky answers we receive.
- vii. **Sophia Nowers:** I could see not replacing 3.2 but maybe adding another question to clarify. Phrasing "inefficiencies" is out. Any issues with removing the pilot program question in 3.6?
- viii. **Connor Chen:** I was wondering what the rationale was for cutting the question?
- ix. **Sophia Nowers:** The university is likely to adopt the 24hr working pilot program, the pilot is going to extend through December, so it likely won't change much.

- x. **Noah Roberts:** I like the wording put by Dylan in the chat, it gives the opportunities for rather than a bad interpretation, more what are you doing to fix the problem. It opens more of a conversation.
- xi. **Dylan Perfect:** I did make a small edit, and it might open a question. There is more specificity in there in terms of what the committee might be looking for. I am not too particular about the specific wording just thought it would be helpful.
- xii. **Sophia Nowers:** Perhaps this could be more specific? Or if we should just cut that clause completely. Anyone else have any edits? No, alright back to the pilot program discussion. What was your question again Connor?
- xiii. **Connor Chen:** I was just asking about why it was struck out, but with the reason you said, it does make sense in why it is not as important to keep it in for this fiscal year. We don't need to keep in the fluff.
- xiv. **Sophia Nowers:** I've been told that HR will be doing a look back period to see if it is good to be adopted, so other parts of the university will likely raise questions.
- xv. **Dylan Perfect:** Was this in the BRD last year? I'm not super toned in on the pilot program and how long they are going to be keeping it. If it is going to be the last year as the pilot, I am curious to what the answers were last year as well. Was there more of a rationale?
- xvi. **Sophia Nowers:** I understand it will be extended; Steve can elaborate more?
- xvii. **Steve Hoelscher:** This pilot was intended to end June 30th, they want HR to get more data, what was trending is that it was going to end and then would become permanent. What HR wanted to see is a longer lookback period. There may be more unforeseen tax liabilities. The pilot has proven to be successful and there have not been many intended tax issues, but HR did want 6 more months. At the end of December, HR will likely make a

decision but that will be contingent on the data they see and review.

- xviii. **Sophia Nowers:** Thank you, Steve, any more questions regarding this topic? HR is not likely going to be using our budget rationale documents as evidence
- xix. **Steve Hoelscher:** They will be looking at instances of unintended consequences from lack of monitoring, at times the 24hr mark has drifted closer to 30hrs which is where we would encounter tax issues for the student and employer. It is up to this committee to determine whether it is necessary to include this question here.
- xx. **Sophia Nowers:** It could be helpful with looking at how to allocate hours, but I think it is more operational. It is an interesting question to ask, but it would likely not be relevant to the BRD.
- xxi. **Sophia Nowers:** In section 4 we have a little feedback on 4.3, but I think we will be keeping 4.3 the way it is. On 4.5 there was a suggestion for the wording, it seems like a hypothetical which may not work in the end.
- xxii. **Dylan Perfect:** Is this question about the 0% impact column? I think the 0% impact can be useful, and I know it must be calculated. At the end of the day the incidental fee has had an exponential growth curve, I do think these numbers on the index level can be helpful in terms of if we do want to limit our spending in areas that aren't as focused on direct economic benefit to students. I think that data could be helpful even though we are sometimes reticent to use it. I would support the column and the simplified question for the budget template. I realistically do not think that we would approve a 0% impact budget.
- xxiii. **Sophia Nowers:** Yeah, that does make sense, it is easier to make that reduction when someone has written it out for you. It could though reveal what positions or programs would be

directly cut if ASOSU would produce a 0% impact. Budget managers would also be guessing what would be cut. I am sensitive to the fact that the fee has increased a lot, hopefully we can find ways to keep it from increasing and the 4% cap will help with that.

- xxiv. **Dylan Perfect:** I think I'll probably leave it at that but all that is understandable, especially if there is a 0% impact, but a budget can be a statement of priorities, and it might be in the interest to have that known. I think the benefit to that information could outweigh any potential office politics that might arise from that information.
- xxv. **Sophia Nowers:** Asking for the whole budget anyways does help answer the question as to what might get cut, but not giving the nitty gritty details that maybe someone might not like to have publicized.
- xxvi. **Noah Roberts:** If the 0% column would be gone, would it be better to possibly combine 4.5 and 4.6 into a single question? Maybe getting rid of the percentage altogether and phrase it in a different way? It would still get us answers and we wouldn't have to create a hypothetical.
- xxvii. **Sophia Nowers:** So, it would be asking qualitatively and not quantitatively?
- xxviii. **Noah Roberts:** Yes, but I am interested to hear what other people think about it.
- xxix. **Sophia Nowers:** It might be hard to ask a qualitative question when dealing with budgets, but I understand what you are saying. If you wanted to come up with a proposed way to combine those, we can definitely look at that.
- xxx. **Noah Roberts:** Having it worded the way it is fine, but there is probably something we can clarify that might be helpful.
- xxxi. **Sophia Nowers:** So maybe we will stick with this, unless anyone has a way to re-write that. If not, we will adopt the suggested re-wording. However, if we ask a question about cuts we will get

the same reaction, so it is a matter of finding the best way to ask this question without getting that natural response. Alright, the old wording is being deleted. Next, we have 4.6, which is some feedback from FSS, they calculate with 3% for our template but FSS may receive from the budget office another number for basic inflation. I am not sure what S&S stands for.

- xxxii. **Steve Hoelscher:** S&S stands for Services and Supplies which is essentially the “other costs” and not the personnel costs.
- xxxiii. **Sophia Nowers:** Thank you. Essentially, they do not have all the estimates yet, but it is something to keep in mind that inflation might not be a 3% increase. There may be higher or lower numbers which depends on what good or service it is. Does that make sense? Cool, that is something we can go back over when the budget templates are filled out. They also calculate this manually for us, but sometimes it is useful information and other times it is not necessary because it is not accurate.
- xxxiv. **Sophia Nowers:** No suggested edits for Section 5, so we will continue to ask these. Finally, we have the proposed questions from the budgets committee. Any thoughts on the 1st question?
- xxxv. **Dylan Perfect:** So, the first question is just a little more specific, I would be inclined to keep the 3rd question because the fact that we gathered that answer would be looked at more favorably. I would keep their 3rd question and accept the re-wording for the 1st one.
- xxxvi. **Sophia Nowers:** Any more thoughts on the first question? No, alright I will entertain a motion to adopt the first question.
 - 1. **Noah Roberts** motioned, **Lillian Goodyear** seconded, no objections. Motion passes.
- xxxvii. **Sophia Nowers:** I plan to add these on at the end and write them as the “Budgets Committee Questions” rather than find specific sections, unless anyone thinks otherwise. For question 2, I did not get any feedback.

- xxxviii. **Noah Roberts:** It says “what metrics do you use to gauge the success and continuation of a package” is this asking after the package has been passed how do you measure the metrics in the next fee setting cycle?
- xxxix. **Sophia Nowers:** I think I read it as something that's already passed, we can rewrite the question to make that clearer. I think this is a useful question.
- xl. **Dylan Perfect:** Question #2 is good in my opinion.
- xli. **Steve Hoelscher:** What I might offer, even though this is ultimately your decision, is that the question doesn't illicit them to share what metrics. We might want to add something that would encourage units to share the metrics, so it might be good to add a third piece to the question. For example, if units have metrics, it would be good to ask them to share that information.
- xl.ii. **Sophia Nowers:** I see that as a good decision. The BRD does come out of the SFC so even though these are budget committee questions, these questions are also a product of the SFC as well. Thoughts?
- xl.iii. **Noah Roberts:** I like the addition; I think more information coming to us will be looked at more favorably.
- xl.iiii. **Sophia Nowers:** Alright we will keep this question in as I have edited it, and now on to the last question. I received feedback that this question may be too granular for the BRD and might be a good question to ask during deliberations. Any thoughts?
- xl.v. **Dylan Perfect:** So, I understand the limitations here but trying to gain any information and we will likely be looked at favorably by the committee. This is also topical to what is going on now, and students are concerned about this.
- xl.vi. **Saegis Abbott:** I think it would be good to give them a heads-up that that question might be asked during deliberations. This question might require a little more thought to respond to, it would be good to have more reflection before deliberations.

xlvi. **Noah Roberts:** I agree with Saegis, I brought up that I don't know if we would be getting answers that would be substantial, but at the least it would be there and asked.

xlviii. **Sophia Nowers:** So, it sounds like it would be good to at least let them know beforehand so they can have answers prepared

xliv. **Saegis Abbott:** One last thing, was there something done to address more pilot programs being added to the budget?

i. **Sophia Nowers:** Not that I know of.

ii. **Steve Hoelscher:** Saegis, were you maybe referring to decision packages generally, or specifically the pilot programs?

iii. **Saegis Abbott:** I guess it could be both, the purpose would be a re-evaluation. By default, we are raising the fee each year, and it is caused by a process and less so caused by decisions.

liii. **Sophia Nowers:** So essentially a check-in before the budgets gets renewed? From what I know, at least for the DSL and ISL, their physical spaces were discontinued, but they are still hiring coordinators.

lii. **Saegis Abbott:** We are also the ones that give athletic tickets, and I don't know how much that costs are, and I would like to know the cost on that as well as others. So, we could be a continuous review item, or a one-time review.

lv. **Sophia Nowers:** That falls more under the SAB's and not the SFC, because we would end up having very long meetings. Athletics used to be a unit, and now it is under the ASOSU budget. I think maybe the continuous review could be something changed for next year, but not right now. Any more final comments on the BRD.

1. **Lauren Camou** motioned for a vote; **Lillian Goodyear** seconded. The motion to adopt the questions **passed with 10 ayes from: Sophia Nowers, Saegis Abbott, Lillian Goodyear, Connor Chen, Madison Wusstig, Lauren Camou, Angelo Arredondo, Noah Roberts, Oliver Devereux, and Narmeen Rashid.** 1 abstention from: **Dylan Perfect.**

IX. Chair Announcements

- a. All ASOSU training (Sept 20th)
 - i. **Sophia Nowers:** Sent out the training, it is optional but encouraged. They will be doing values training, office of general council, and then headshots.
- b. UBC Tuition Forum (Nov. 6th, 5-6 pm)
- c. First Fall Term meeting (Sept 26th, 6-7:30 pm)
 - i. **Sophia Nowers:** I am still working on room reservation for that
- d. Voting in ASOSU referendum until Sept 10th
 - i. **Sophia Nowers:** Should have gotten an email, please vote and tell all your friends to vote.
- e. Pay Check in
 - i. **Sophia Nowers:** If anyone has been having issues with pay, please reach out to me or Keri Simonet to get that figured out.

X. Member Comments

- a. **Saegis Abbott:** About the pay, since I work multiple jobs at the university, do you know if it will be separate payments?
- b. **Noah Roberts:** I work multiple jobs as well and it should just be one lump sum, but you can check.
- c. **Lauren Camou:** I put all the information on the trainings in the chat, just so that it is known.

XI. Advisor Comments

- a. **Steve Hoelscher:** Good engagement tonight. While the BRD discussion is abstract, the investment of time you guys made tonight will help during the fall. Enjoy the rest of your summer, and I will see you all in person soon!

XII. Adjournment

- a. *Meeting adjourned at 7:23 p.m.*