

Committee to Review Allocable Segregated Fee Policies
Notes of September 28, 2007 Meeting

The meeting was held in Room 1820 of the Van Hise Building on the UW-Madison campus. It began at approximately 3:00 p.m.

Committee members present: Bunnell, Berquam, Brady, Dewees, French, Gallagher, Glodowski (participating by telephone), Shields, Soll, Viney. (Note: Due to other commitments, Ms. Berquam and Mr. Glodowski left the meeting prior to its conclusion.)

Committee members absent: None.

Committee staff present: Hendrix, Rubin.

Committee staff absent: None.

Others present: Kevin Helmkamp, UW-Madison Dean of Students' Office; Renee Stephenson, UW System Budget Office; various observers.

Following introductions, Chancellor Bunnell reviewed the committee's charge as stated in Regent President Bradley's letter of appointment dated August 31, 2007. She emphasized that the focus is on allocable segregated fees and that the committee is to build upon the work of a prior committee that has already reviewed the proposed policy redraft that was provided with the agenda materials. The committee has been charged with making its recommendations to President Reilly in time for him to report back to the Board of Regents at its November, 2007 meeting. The November deadline was selected so that the policies applicable to segregated fee budget development will be in place in time to develop the 2008-09 budget accordingly.

A round robin discussion of the following questions, included with the agenda, ensued:

- What are your criteria for recognizing student organizations?
- Is the distinction between allocable and nonallocable fees clear at your campus?
- What types of activities do you fund or not fund through allocable segregated fees?
- Do you currently provide funds for off-campus rental space?
- Do you currently provide funds to support salaries of student organization employees?
- Do you place any annual limits on allocable segregated fee expenditures?

Major points emerging from the discussion were:

Recognition of student organizations: Each campus reported that it has clearly understood criteria. EAU reported that it has a "two tier system" in which not all recognized student organizations are automatically eligible to apply for segregated fee funding; additional requirements apply in order to be eligible for funding. Brady stated that the presumption under Southworth is that there is only one class of registered student organizations and that all student organizations are equally eligible to apply for, but not necessarily, receive funding. Additional criteria for funding should be applied as part of the funding process rather than on the "front end" as part of the recognition process.

Allocable vs. non allocable fees: The general belief is that “allocable” and “nonallocable” are adequately defined but that there may occasionally be room for debate when applying the definitions to particular situations. Some believe there is a lack of clarity in the current policy regarding the decision making process for how an ultimate determination is made. However, the prevailing presumption is that the ultimate decision rests with the chancellor with the expectation that there is meaningful consultation with the students to inform his / her decision. EAU reported that some nonallocable fees, notably for health care, are treated as allocable in deference to students’ greater role for that portion of the segregated fee budget. Generally speaking this is not a problem but could be if a dispute should arise. Dewees asked why, by Board policy, only allocable fee disputes can be appealed to the Board of Regents. Gallagher supplied the history behind the Board’s adoption of this provision and the general consensus was that this is not an issue to revisit at the current time.

Types of activities funded: All institutions fund student government, student organizations, student media, cultural activities, etc., with some variations in the specifics of local practice. The range of items funded is reported to be evolving. MSN is alone in funding services with allocable segregated fees.

Space issues: In light of the recent Board of Regents’ decision on the ASM appeal, no campus will use allocable segregated fee to pay for rent in off-campus facilities not owned or leased by the university. A limitation of the university’s ability to provide on-campus space for all registered student organizations, particularly at MSN, was reported to be a problem.

Staff: All universities reported some student hourly staff and /or professional university staff employed by RSOs and / or university departments. These staff are hired and supervised by other university staff and not by students. MSN is alone in funding professional staff who are not university employees but rather employees of the RSO.

Limits of allocable segregated fee budget: PLT and OSH reported that the chancellor and students agree in advance on the upper limit of the segregated fee budget. EAU and MSN reported that there is no advance agreement. Dewees reports that there is no prior agreement at UW-Washington County but that the allocable portion of the segregated fee stays within the overall limit for segregated fees established by UW System. (Stephenson explained that segregated fee increases over a prescribed threshold are subject to additional scrutiny by the UW System Budget Office and by the Board of Regents in adopting the annual operating budget; this threshold is applied to the overall segregated fee increase and not separately to the allocable and nonallocable portions of the fee.) Chancellor Bunnell reported that there has been no prior agreement at STP in the past but that she will likely initiate this process going forward.

Based on the preceding discussion, and committee members individual review of the proposed policy as currently re-drafted, the committee identified nine issues for discussion at its next meeting:

- Should the term “segregated university fees” continue to be used?
- The process for deciding whether a fee for a given purpose is allocable or non-allocable

- Minimum criteria for recognition of student organizations
- May allocable fees be used to pay for the costs of non-university staff?
- Allocation of on-campus space and leasing of off-campus space
- Operational costs of student organizations
- Contracting for services
- Should the upper limit of the allocable segregated fee budget be agreed upon in advance?
- Academic credit for internship with allocable fee funded student organizations

Various dates were discussed for a possible second meeting and committee members ultimately agreed to meet the afternoon of October 15th in Stevens Point. (Note: This meeting date was subsequently changed to October 16th.)

The committee discussed the timeline for completion of its work and concluded that there is not sufficient time to do so prior to the November Board meeting – under the assumption that “completion of the committee’s work” involves agreement on a draft policy, circulating that draft for campus / student comment, and assimilating those comments into a finalized policy document that would be forwarded to President Reilly. Chancellor Bunnell stated that she would ask Regent President Bradley to extend the timeline until the Board’s December meeting. The Board of Regents does not meet in January and delaying until February would not meet the goal of having the policy guidelines in place to inform the development of the 2008-09 budget. Regent Shields asked what action the Board would be asked to take in connection with President Reilly’s report. The presumption is that President will report any major changes to current policy and will obtain Board concurrence with these changes in whatever form is appropriate. It is not anticipated that the Board will be asked to adopt the full policy redraft as a Board of Regents policy.

The meeting adjourned shortly after 7:00 p.m.