

CSA Meeting Minutes
April 10, 2007

Singla called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m.

Members present: Dodovich, Singla, Gordon, Boley (Marion), Lee, Mull (Hodak), Hollingsworth, Thatcher, Stetson, Knapp, Mrozek, Dupaix, Cano, Stuck, Reed, Vollmar

Member absent: Spinrad, USG Regional Campus representative, Klosterman, Smith

Guests: Laura Corry (Chair, Allocations Committee), Matt Couch, Jake McKim, Kai Robinson, Bill Brown, Brian Hoffman, Sabrina Rosentraub

Speaker/Presentations

Student Activity Fee Review Committee: Sabrina Rosentraub, chair, presented an overview of the Student Activity Fee Review CSA Ad-Hoc Committee Report. The presentation was followed by a discussion period. Hollingsworth asked if the Council could come to a decision on the increase of the fee immediately with the allocation of the fee discussed further to enable him to notify the appropriate administrators to allow for Board action. Singla indicated that the report does not recommend raising the fee until FY2009 which means that immediate action is not required. Stuck indicated that the Review Committee did not have an opportunity to address faculty/staff buy-in or regional campus buy-in. Dodovich requested time to read the document. The meeting was recessed for a short time for individuals to review the report.

Hollingsworth inquired about the auditing process of fee money allocated to student governments in particular. Stuck indicated that the Ohio Union works with and will continue to work with the three student governments to ensure that spending processes are in order.

Dodovich requested that the Committee add information about the methodology used at the open forum to the report. Rosentraub stated that it would be added. She stated that there was an open door policy from 12 -5 p.m. Anyone who attended was asked to fill out a survey and was encouraged to participate in a discussion with committee members.

Reed questioned the high carry forward rationale for cutting the allocation to student organizations indicating that the process used by allocations was prohibitive rather than demonstrating a lack of need for the funds. Rosentraub indicated that her charge did not include making decisions for the Allocations Committee. Couch indicated that it is expected that demand will exceed supply next year and a quality of program assessment will need to be made by Allocations unlike the current process where requests are basically granted if they fit within Allocation's Guidelines. Couch stated that there was a high variance in quality of the programs funded over the years. Singla indicated the cut only affected programming funds, not operating funds. Couch indicated that the proposal calls for the same amount of funds for student organizations although as a total, a smaller percentage of the fee. Dodovich indicated that the proposal would mean a \$50K decrease in real dollars for student organizations. Hodak provided information regarding the purpose of the fee at the time of its creation. The overriding goal was

to improve large campus events. At the time, USG was opposed to allocating what is now the current amount of funds to student organizations. Ultimately, a compromise was reached providing approximately \$100K more to student organizations that was available through CSA Allocations prior to the implementation of the Student Activity Fee.

Hollingsworth questioned the supply and demand issue and asked whether the allocations process was cumbersome and why some organizations don't apply. Stuck indicated that organizations might see USG as an easier alternative. Singla indicated that this is an Allocations issue to look into how training occurs and information is disseminated. Hollingsworth asked that the Council look into potential explanations for the surplus. Stetson indicated that in his several years of experience on Allocations, there has been lengthy discussion on the process and that there has been an increase in "gaming the system" and that the process is not cumbersome. Reed stated that students might be confused. Hollingsworth indicated that one purpose of the fee was to avoid organizations requesting funds from multiple sources. Hodak indicated that there is substantial information provided to every treasurer and primary leader of a registered student organization. Historically, there was not the inclination in USG to provide funds for student organizations, particularly since USG was opposed to even the current funding for student organizations during the implementation of the activity fee. It was not imaginable that USG would use \$100K of its budget for funding of student organizations. Rosentraub indicated the rationale for cutting student organizations. The Committee did not want to impact OUAB given the competitive nature of the market from which OUAB draws programs. It was seen as impractical to take money from the student organizations because CGS does not allocate any resources to student organizations and IPC has such a small budget. Funds would only be available from USG. Reducing the allocations of IPC and CGS would disproportionately impact those groups.

Stetson argued that USG could help simplify the process of organizations funding by agreeing to give up that amount of money used to fund student organizations to be disbursed by Allocations through the regular process which would heighten the accounting standards as well. Reed stated that USG would not be interested in doing this. Dodovich indicated that USG's process was more personalized with an individual for a point of contact, less mechanical allowing a student organization to pair up with a senator as a backer for the program. Dodovich indicated that the organizations receive more credibility based on the trust in the senator/backer from the committee that makes decisions regarding USG funding of student organization programs. Gordo said that the student organizations prefer going to USG because there are no rules or substantially weaker guidelines to receive funding and that student organizations do not want to have to follow any rules to receive programming funding. Mrozek indicated that Allocations will look into issues of staffing in regard to helping organizations navigate the funding process as well as look at opportunities to provide pre-payment for programs rather than reimbursement only.

Singla asked the Council whether Allocations or the Ad Hoc should look into the student organization funding process. Dodovich suggested that the issue be sent to Allocations. Marion suggested tabling further discussion on the issues of student organization funding pending further research. Singla indicated that the issue would be referred to Allocations. Hollingsworth

suggested that Allocations look at the needs of student organizations, the impediments, if any, to receiving funding, and discuss whether modifications to the funding process are necessary.

Reed asked why the particular dollar amounts for increases were proposed. Rosentraub indicated that the Ad Hoc thought that \$20 was too much and \$17 would be sufficient if efficiently used. The \$2 increase covers the cost of inflation because the fee was not increased for five years. The additional \$.50 per quarter increase each year compensates for the erosion of spending power based on inflation.

Mrozek stated that where to take the money from to fund the new initiative and increase existing ones is still an issue. Marion asked whether OAA is funding any alternative spring break programs because our peer institutions generally fund those types of programs through academic affairs. Singla indicated that the Ad Hoc engaged in lengthy discussion of on OAA funding of ASB but that OAA is not supportive of funding the program. Singla indicated that the report requests that ASB seek additional funds for an alternate source.

Singla asked whether the Council felt they could move forward without additional information on student organization funding processes. Reed indicated he would like additional information. Corry indicated that carry forward would not happen this year and that the allocations process was user friendly, student organizations know how to use the system, that the system is personal although not as much as USG. Corry did indicate so research was needed on issues post approval on the redemption rate. Gordon indicated that the redemption rate may not be that unusual since CGS sees it in the Ray Award in cases where students request more than they actually spend to travel to the conference. Gordon indicated that she thinks an assessment of the allocations process is in order but that the assessment is ultimately unrelated to how the SAF monies are allocated.

Stetson asked whether student organizations still require dues. Hodak indicated that when the SAF was initially proposed, the intent was not to eliminate the need for organizations to charge dues because the group who created the fee and the administration at the time saw a value in personal commitment to a student organization. Singla indicated that the discussion on the draft report was productive and the information would be shared with the Ad Hoc. Any additional thoughts, comments and/or suggestions were requested to be sent to Singla or Rosentraub.

Code of Student Conduct Review

Singla provided an overview of the proposed changes. Cano asked what attempt meant. Hollingsworth said that it would be an act in furtherance of the prohibited conduct and that a definition of attempt may need to be included in the Code. Lee asked about the application of the Code to CED students and said that the Code could be clearer. Lee indicated that the Code should be clear when it pertains to unenrolled but admitted students.

Hollingsworth pointed out that there has been some criticism of the University's approach to sexual misconduct with a very general definition without commonly use labels. Singla said that the Ad Hoc is working to evaluate the highest priority areas like redefining sexual misconduct. Stetson indicated that there is a tension between using itemized and general language.

Hollingsworth agreed saying that there is a tension between clearly communicating baseline prohibited conduct while avoiding loss of jurisdiction due to more specific enumeration of conduct. Singla asked the Council to discuss the inclusion of biased assessment as an aggravating factor in the sanctioning phase of the process. Singla discusses the advantages and disadvantages of using an enumerated list or citing local, state, and federal law. Mrozek indicated that citing law may exclude sexual orientation and gender identity from coverage.

Cano indicated that he did not support the change that character witnesses are only permitted to provide written statements, with the change justified for administrative convenience. Hollingsworth proposed a compromise position, allowing two character witnesses to testify in person and an unlimited number of written character statements. Cano suggested requiring statements to be notarized. Hodak suggested that this might be burdensome for some character witnesses, particularly those not affiliated with the University and unable to get free notarization. Reed disagreed stating that it wouldn't be overly burdensome. Dodovich suggested a permissible rather than required standard.

Hodak suggested that the two year terms are staggered so that there is continuity year to year. Dodovich indicated that the committee would be suggesting that.

Hollingsworth indicated that based on the interpretation of Title IX and the lawsuit that was settled, it is necessary to change the evidentiary standard from clear and convincing to preponderance at least in the context of sexual misconduct. Hollingsworth stated that the preponderance standard was used by 2/3 of universities and that it would be burdensome to institute a dual system requiring two different evidentiary standards. Hodak indicated that preponderance was the standard in the Code for academic misconduct. Mrozek asked whether the 2/3 usage rate preponderance was accurate. Hollingsworth indicated the Office of Judicial Affairs is confirming with ASJA.

Singla asked the committee to submit any additional thoughts and comments to her.

Approval of Minutes

Stetson moved approval of the April 10, 2007 minutes; Gordon seconded. The motion passed by acclamation with the suggested changes.

Mrozek asked to rearrange the agenda to allow for Student Government reports to precede the remaining portions of the agenda. There was no objection.

Student Government Reports

IPC – Vollmar presented the report. Elections will take place May 6 with inauguration immediately following. Two students are running for each the office of president and vice president. One student is running for secretary. The Unite for Sight speaker was well received. Money was raised to pay for approximately 50 cataract surgeries. The case competition went

well. IPC will be bringing in Dr. Robert Beckman to lecture on how to be an effective communicator on May 17, 2007.

CGS – Marion presented the report. The Edward F. Hayes Graduate Research Forum was a success. Elections will take place on May 4, 2007. CGS is currently accepting applications for the Siddens Award for Graduate Advising and the Distinguished Service Award. The review process for the Ray Travel Awards is underway. There was a meeting with Dean Osmar on changes to doctoral funding. May 11, 2007 will be the spring barbeque.

USG – Knapp presented the report. Elections concluded with Christobek/Steele the successful presidential/vice presidential ticket. They are working on putting their cabinet together. The new Senate will be meeting next week. USG has spent all of its money recently allocating funds to a student health line, Clean Sweep, a fundraising program for student organizations benefiting campus neighborhoods, and the Center for Financial Wellness. The transition into office will occur over the summer. The last Senate meeting of the current Senate is May 2, 2007.

Old Business

None.

Subcommittee Reports

Student Affairs - Hollingsworth

D'Andra Mull successfully defended her dissertation. Questions were raised regarding the merger of OIA and OIE. Hollingsworth suggested that the chair invite OAA to present on the issue.

Subcommittee A – Dodovich

A proposal to fund the officer positions of president and vice president of IPC to the deans of the professional colleges has been recreated by the president and vice president of IPC, Stetson through a meeting with Dr. Joseph Barr.

Subcommittee B – Boley

The committee is waiting on written documentation for the Office of Legal Affairs. Unanimous consent is expected of the policy pending the documentation from Legal.

Allocations – Corry

The next Allocations meeting will be Friday. Guidelines changes will be voted on in advance of the May 1 deadline. These changes include the definition of service, the auditing policy, fundable (addition of temporary construction) and non-fundable expenses (addition of Explore Columbus tickets, lottery tickets, and software). Allocations is also proposing an exemption of the on-campus rule during Ohio Union reconstruction as long as the student organizations work with a Union event planner who recommends that an event is best located off-campus with funds going to fund the program but not the off-campus facility.

Singla suspended the remaining portion of the agenda (announcements).
Singla adjourned the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kerry M. Hodak (for D'Andra Mull)