

11-8-2017

AFRC minutes 11/08/2017

Activity Fee Review Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/afrc>

Recommended Citation

Activity Fee Review Committee, "AFRC minutes 11/08/2017" (2017). *Activity Fee Review Committee*. 23.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/afrc/23>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Activity Fee Review Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

In attendance:

Dave Israels-Swenson (DS)
Alec Santelman (AS)
Renee Seykora (RS)
Duncan Vermillion (DV)
Tom Ladner (TL)
Jessica Gardner (JG)
Sara Carman (SC)
Parker Smith (PS)
Denis Ostroushko (DO)
Aurora Cordes (AC)

Topic: In regards to the MN Omnibus Education Bill with regard to student fees.

Joined in discussion at 8:05 PM.

DS Powerpoint:

Five classes/buckets of fees:

Student activity fees
Academic fees
Administrative fees
Health Service Fees
Debt Obligations - we don't have any of these

Health service fee = \$103

Academic fees, we have them but are not within the scope of AFRC

Looking at Student Activity and Administrative fees, which need to be separated in a consistent way across campuses.

4: What criteria used to separate the fees?

DS: Who controls the money.

4: Why is the projector so big?

DS: Because it's laser.

Procedural Questions:

Current: Activity fee groups present to AFRC each year and are allotted a flat allocation. If enrollment is up, gets a surplus into next year, if down, vice versa.

Admin fee groups: Get a flat allocation - if deficit, they must deal with deficit.

Future Procedure Discussion:

JG: I think we should keep Activity fee groups the same as they are now.

AS: We would still control the administrative fee amounts?

DS: (Affirmative)

DS: Groups in administrative would only have to come to you if they wanted to change the flat amount they want.

DS: Because the admin and activity fees are being split, it might be a good idea to raise the internal definition of student activity fees so that student activities can keep programming.

4: The big pro is that the admin groups would have to deal with the money themselves, right?

DS: Yes, but the con would be that they would not give you a budget. A third option would be to have the admin groups give you a fee.

4: I think we should give them the per-student flat rate, because they're school focused and we're student-focused.

AS: They're not entirely student groups, but they are groups that cater to students and are run by students. We shouldn't give up some control we have to make our lives a little easier on one weekend.

DS: (Shows a spreadsheet with 5-year averages of student group fee usage)

JG: Student groups are separate from admin things - we should give a flat fee to admin groups like CAC.

AS: I think we compromise our ability to adjust if we give a flat rate to CAC.

2: Key deciding factor is how much oversight do we want to have over student fees.

AS: We should have guidelines to deal with the new bill's restrictions.

DS: Questions: figure out how to treat activity fee groups and administrative fee groups.

Tom Ladner: Motion to treat activity fee groups as have in the past: seconded and passed.

AS: I would like to still hear from administrative fee groups for at least a year.

DS: Could set a schedule that requires groups to come to AFRC periodically for review

AS: We should vote on whether or not we want administration fees in transition of being transferred from to be required to budget reviewed.

2: I move to require all new administrative groups to require a review of budget and then defer later judgement - seconded, and passed.

DV: I AM AGAINST WHATEVER COMES OUT OF HIS [PS] MOUTH!!!!

PS: Perhaps we could encode Robert's Rules of order into our guidelines.

DV: Move to adjourn, seconded, and passed.

Adjourned at 8:53 PM.