

Organizational Activities Fee Review Committee Final Report

Three Year Review of the Athletic Fee, Activities
Fee, and Environmental Sustainability Fee:
2016-2017

**Submitted Unanimously
April 24, 2017**

Members of the Committee

Kailey Micek

Chair

Cassidy Smestad

Athletic Fee Representative

Megan Neveau

Student Activities Board Representative

Rachel Hanson

Funds Allotment Council Representative

Remy McClain

Student Government Representative

Adrian Wheeler

Environmental Sustainability Fee Representative

Annali Cler

Student at Large

Keegan Good

Student at Large

Tana Neels

Student at Large

Executive Summary

At present, the fee breakdown is as follows:

Athletic Fee is a total of \$58.00 per student per semester.

Activities Fee is divided:

\$26.70 (59%) to the Student Activities Board,
\$9.55 (21%) to the Funds Allotment Council,
\$2.00 (4%) to Student Government,
\$3.75 (8%) to the Collegiate Readership Program,
\$3.00 (7%) to the Center for Student Involvement

for a total of \$45.00 per student per semester.

Environmental Sustainability Fee is a total of \$5.00 per student per semester.

The 2016-2017 OAF Review Committee has met successfully over the course of the academic year and brings to the attention of Student Government these recommendations regarding the use and allocation of student initiated fees:

1. The Funds Allotment Council (FAC) should receive a \$0.95 per student per semester (\$1.90 per year) increase in funding, to be diverted from the surplus in the Collegiate Readership Program,
2. The Student Activities Board (SAB) should receive a \$0.30 per student per semester (\$0.60 per year) increase in funding, also to be diverted from the surplus in the Collegiate Readership Program,
3. The Student Government should receive no change in funding,
4. The Collegiate Readership Program (CRP) should receive a \$1.25 per student per semester (\$2.50 per year) decrease in funding, subsidizing increases to FAC and SAB, and
5. The CSI Fee should receive no change in funding.

This accompanying report contains a detailed account of the review process and justification for each of the recommendations presented as well as organizational recommendations.

Introduction and Purpose

Student initiated fees are those fees assessed to students that were voted on and approved by the Student Association. These fees currently account for roughly \$1,000,000.00 in annual receipts or \$108.00 per student. These funds are used for student based services and organizations. Currently student initiated fees fund the Student Activities Board, the Funds Allotment Council, Student Government, the Collegiate Readership Program, the Student Athletic Fee, and the Environmental Sustainability Fee.

The Organization Activities Fee (OAF) Review Committee, which will hereby be referenced as the Committee, convenes once every three academic years for the purpose of auditing and reviewing how student initiated fees were spent. The 2016-2017 academic year Committee is comprised of 8 voting members consisting of a student at large acting as chair, three additional students at large, one representative each from the Student Activities Board (SAB), the Funds Allotment Council (FAC), and Student Government, Chair of the Athletic Fee Accountability Committee, and Chair of the Environmental Sustainability Fee.

The Committee is tasked with examining the expenditures of student initiated fees. The role of this committee is to ensure that student fees are being spent in a responsible and practical manner in a way that best serves the Student Association. This charge manifests itself in the form of official recommendations made in reference to each of the groups under review.

Recommendations are made in this report in such a way as to mirror the ballot language requested by the Committee for when the recommendations were voted upon by the Student Association.

It should be noted that the Committee interpreted their task to be the completion of a financial auditing and process review. The Committee reviewed the entirety of each organization and committee, but only noted deficiencies. While we recognize that there are proficiencies in these organizations, the Committee did not feel that it was our main task to report on them.

Methodology

Given the time constraints placed on the Committee this review cycle, organizing and executing research endeavors required substantial forethought and decisive action. The Committee met weekly during the period of the review (roughly early november to late April) to provide reports on individually assigned tasks as well as have general group discussion. During our later meetings we discussed and voted on final recommendations. Meetings were also held with each organization and/or its executive board. Here, the Committee could ask specific questions regarding the usage and appropriation of student funds. Each organization was also given the opportunity to make a funding request. The Committee is understanding of the fact that these funds are crucial for each Fee-Based organization so we made clear at the beginning of each meeting that our intent was not to attack the organization or its portion of the fee. In addition to meeting with the members of these organization, the Committee met with each advisor: Laura Bates (Student Government), Adam McMichael (SAB), and Damon Pee (FAC). They were able to give a different perspective on the inner workings of their organizations as well share experiences they have had working in the Center for Student Involvement (CSI). The Committee also held a meeting with Jerry Wollmering the Director of Athletics. He shared with us his involvement with the Athletic Fee and his opinions on how the fee is beneficial to the entire Student Association. Finally, throughout the review period we sought advice from our advisor Vice President of Student Affairs, Lou Ann Gilchrist.

As an additional supplement, student opinion on the subject matter for OAF was measured in two ways: One, by means of a survey sent out to the entire body and two, through a focus group consisting of 12 randomly selected students from a variety of organizations across campus. The survey was kept live for 10 days and closed with 397 respondents. The survey gave us a clear understanding of student opinion on the Athletic Fee as well as good insight on the Environmental Sustainability Fee. Additionally, we gathered general information about Student Government, FAC, SAB, and the CRP. The survey results are attached to this document and can be viewed by clicking on the link provided. The second measurement of student opinion came through our focus group. Twenty organizations were randomly selected and contacted regarding providing a representative for our focus group. From those 20, 12 were able to provide a representative. At the focus group we discussed each fee the OAF Committee was reviewing. The session lasted 1 hour and 20 minutes. When making conclusions about the focus group we took into account that there was a possible bias given the fact that each member was involved in 2 or more organizations on campus. Ultimately, we did find opinions and suggestions from this focus group helpful.

After individually composing the final report, the Committee met to finish formatting and ready it for submission.

Athletics Fee

The Athletic Fee is currently \$58 a semester (\$116.00 a year) per student. The Athletic fee is also currently tied to the Consumer Price Index, which in this past year increased 2.7 percent. At this rate, if the Athletic fee were to increase by that full amount it would be \$119.14 for the 2017-2018 academic school year. The Committee is formed every three years to review student fees, including the Athletic Fee. Given the purpose of this review the current Committee does not find it necessary for the Fee to be tied to the Consumer Price Index. This will ensure any funding changes for this fee come from the Committee with final approval from a vote from the Student Association. No other fee is tied to CPI, so we felt it necessary to change this fee to match the others. This also gives students more control over how they want their money to be spent, and increases visibility and accountability for the committee.

When surveying the Student Association in the Spring of 2017, there were 2 important questions involving the Athletic Fee. First, out of 395 responses, and out of 1-5 (1 being none and 5 being completely), students had an average response of 3.09, meaning students had a moderate understanding of what the Athletic Fee does. However, once the student were able to read a summary about what the Athletic Fee does, that average increased to 4.40. Second, when asked “Do you believe that the money being spent from the Athletics Fee is beneficial to all students”, 67.8% of the 393 respondents selected “No, I do not believe that the money being spent from the Athletics Fee is beneficial to all students”, with only 31.2% of students selecting the opposite.

Recommendations from the Committee:

For the future, the Committee recommends that the Athletic Fee Committee takes time to reflect upon the purpose of the Athletic Fee. The Athletic Fee Committee needs to set guidelines on what the Fee can or cannot fund. Furthermore, we urge the Athletics Fee to take other funding options into consideration. For example, both FAC and Student Government can help organizations, intramurals, and club sports when it comes to funding for programs or events. This will allow the Athletic Fee to spend their money on larger projects. When deciding who/what to fund, the Committee needs to take into consideration the length of the slate process to be sure projects are being completed on time. It is also recommended that before the Athletic Department accepts the lowest bid, it ensures the product or service is of good quality.

Additionally, the Committee commends the Athletic Fee's current accountability and visibility to the Student Association and urges the Athletic Fee committee to continue to improve in these two areas over the next few years.

The Athletic Fee is currently in the process of a long-term project, the Committee recommends the next Committee review the Athletics Fee in regards to funding as well as organizationally. We were unable to alter the fee prive given this constraint. The Committee also prohibits the Athletic Fee from starting a new long-term project so the Fee can be accurately reviewed when the next Committee is formed. Details of this recommendation can be found in the Additional Documents portion of the report.

Student Activities Board (SAB)

The Committee recommended that the SAB receive an increase of \$.30 per semester (\$.60 a year) to help offset the rising costs of travel for performers, Sodexo, printing services, and to account for inflation. This increase would come directly from the diverted funds of the Collegiate Readership Program. The Student Association passed this recommendation, with the following ballot language: “I support that the Student Activities Board should receive \$.30 per semester per student (\$.60 a year) diverted from the Collegiate Readership Program. This diversion would maintain current fee levels while still fully funding the Collegiate Readership Program.”

Reasons for Increased Funding:

The Committee has found the Student Activities Board to be sound in operations and an increase in funding necessary. This further allotment is due to increased student funding needs as shown in the budgetary findings and reports examined by the Committee and the desire expressed by students in the survey and focus group results to increase funding for both SAB and FAC events. With the survey results gathered and the focus group intel, we determined that a general request for an increase in the total Activities Fee would not be likely to pass a Student Association vote and would only serve to further frustrate an already fiscally stretched Student Association

The following information was derived from an aggregate of information gathered by the committee from the official funding proposals of the Student Activities Board, the survey results, focus group results, and held against the published budgets and documentation made available to the committee.

Since the last OAF review in 2014, it has become more challenging for SAB to achieve their mission to provide the highest quality entertainment that fulfills the diverse wants and needs of the Student Association due to continually rising costs associated with programming events. Sodexo catering prices have increased, especially since renovations to Mainstreet Market last summer. Printing Services has also steadily increased the costs of printing posters and other materials. Food and publicity alone represent a significant portion of SAB’s yearly allocations (about 5% in 2015-16). The organization has also noticed increasing costs of supplies, prizes, performance and agent fees, travel costs, and other expenses.

SAB also noted increased U.S. urbanization as a factor in schools such as Truman losing leverage in contract negotiations with performers. Kirksville is already geographically off-route for most performers, and it has always been difficult for SAB to attract talent to such a secluded region at competitive prices. As migration continues to trend towards urban centers, the disadvantages of our rural location are intensified. The consequence is that comparable artists, bands, comedians, and speakers are more costly.

We recognized a \$20,000-\$25,000 yearly roll-over in funds that we took into consideration when evaluating necessity of an increase, however realize that these funds are necessary for financial security and risk management purposes, ensuring that the University has a cushion of protection against unexpected legal or contract-based emergencies.

Recommendations from the Committee:

The Committee is also recommending that SAB find ways, besides their surveys, to be held directly accountable by the Student Association. High accessibility and transparency should be of importance due to the large amount of funding SAB receives from the student activity fee. The Committee is asking SAB to be diligent and find and implement new accountability measures by the next review session.

The Committee also recognizes that SAB has been approached, and already has plans to become more accountable to the Student Association. SAB has agreed that they need to grow their transparency and accountability. Some of the ideas that they have either agreed with, or might implement are as follows: making an “action plan” and having the Student Association vote on part of their constitution. They have also stated that they plan to work further ahead on projects; this is so they can function better as an organization. We urge them to keep this in the forefront of their goals. Starting the planning process earlier will help alleviate stress from the advisors as well as avoid having a large amount of events in a small period of time.

Funds Allotment Council (FAC)

The Committee recommends that a proposed increase of funding in the total amount of \$0.95 per student, per semester (\$1.90 per year) be diverted from the Collegiate Readership Fee. This will allow for FAC to have additional funds to meet increased funding requests. The Student Association passed this recommendation with the following ballot language: “I support that Funds Allotment Council should receive an additional \$.95 per semester per student (\$1.90 a year) diverted from the Collegiate Readership Program. This diversion would not increase the Student Activities Fee, while still fully funding the Collegiate Readership Program.”

Reasons for Increased Funding:

The Committee has found the Funds Allotment Council to be sound in operations and an increase in funding necessary. This further allotment is due to increased student funding needs as shown in the budgetary findings and reports examined by the Committee and the desire expressed by students in the survey and focus group results to increase funding for both SAB and FAC events. Additionally, with the survey results gathered and the focus group intel, we determined that a general request for an increase in the total Activities Fee would not be likely to pass a Student Association vote and would only serve to further frustrate an already fiscally stretched Student Association.

Overview of Funding Increase Necessity

The following information was derived from an aggregate of information gathered by the committee from the official funding proposals of the Funds Allotment Council, the survey results, focus group results, and held against the published budgets and documentation made available to the committee. The Committee has held the numbers used by the Funds Allotment Council to be accurate in their calculations when compared with their published budgets, and thus find the language from their proposal with minor modifications appropriate for a portion of explanation of funding necessity.

In recent semesters, the Funds Allotment Council has seen an overall trend of increased total funds requested from organizations. In total, they were able to allot 58.4% of the total funds requested over the last 6 semesters. Over that time period, 67% of the funds deemed meritable have been funded. More specifically, the Funds Allotment Council was able to provide 81.8% of meritable general funds requested and 56.4% of meritable ICA funds requested. There has been an increase in ICA applications from 37 in the spring of 2014 to 46 in the fall of 2016. This

means that the limited funds are stretched even further as they strive to give assistance to as many groups as possible. There are especially limitations in the funds that they are able to provide to ICA teams. These teams not only consist of Truman students, but many of them put on sporting events on campus that bring Truman students as spectators and students from other Universities. Additionally, these teams travel to a variety of other locations representing our school. Several organizations have repeated national competition appearances that allow Truman's name to spread to venues across the nation. However, many of these teams are seeing increased expenses along with decreased FAC funds. This causes unnecessary hardship for the students and serves as a detriment to recruiting efforts.

During the session of applications to receive funding for the Spring 2017 semester, student organizations applied for a total of \$108,567.91. Total acquired funds (TAF) for the spring semester are \$69,956.00, meaning the Funds Allotment Council was only able to fund 64% of what was requested. During the FAC funding process, initial decisions are made with no thought to TAF, but rather according to what events fit our mission and would benefit the Truman State campus as a whole. From this round alone, ideally the Funds Allotment Council would have funded \$92,598.58 or 86.9% of what was requested. As a result, they were forced to cut \$24,848.58 from events that we felt deserved funding. Over the past six semesters the Funds Allotment Council had to cut an average of \$28,942.15 from events they felt deserved funding. However, due to the funding percentage restrictions placed on ICA spending, the council can only fund ICA groups 30-55% of the total allocated funds. ICA groups consistently request more funding than FAC general groups; thus, the amount of funding FAC can give to ICA groups is limited by the amount of funding given to FAC general groups.

The following segment was taken from the FAC proposal:

“The Funds Allotment Council submitted the following statement based on information for a funding increase of \$24,530.94. This would allow us to fund all the organizations that we feel bring valuable events to campus. This would result in an additional cost of \$4.09 per student per semester or \$8.18 per year. However, FAC understands the current financial situation of the University and is sensitive to the decreased amount available funds for several offices around campus. As a result, we examined the minimum amount we would need to be able to continue functioning efficiently and funding a diverse slate of events. Taking this into account, the Funds Allotment Council would like to ask for a funding increase of \$16,138.47 which would allow us to fund all the organizations that we feel bring valuable events to campus on a 50-50 ICA and FAC percentage distribution. This would result in an additional cost of \$2.69 per student per semester or \$5.38 per year. While this is a significant increase, FAC has proven to

be responsible with the student funds given to us and is confident that an increase would benefit the Truman community as a whole.”

Past Impact of Funding Increases

The Funds Allotment Council was able to provide the following information about what the previous increase in funding did for their funding availability:

Average Before Increase					
	Number of Groups Funded	Total Funds Applied For	Total Funds Received	Percent of Funds Received	Amount Not Funded
ICA	17	\$173,526.62	\$50,925.63	29%	\$122,601.00
FAC	24	\$85,350.00	\$52,408.95	61%	\$32,941.05
Total	41	\$258,876.62	\$103,334.58	45%	\$155,542.05

Average After Increase					
	Number of Groups Funded	Total Meritable Funds	Total Funds Received	Percent of Meritable Funds Received	Amount of Meritable Funds Not Funded
ICA	37	\$101,139.53	\$57,008.31	56%	\$44,131.22
FAC	36	\$75,532.19	\$61,779.11	82%	\$13,753.07
Total	73	\$176,671.72	\$118,787.43	69%	\$57,884.29

This information showed the multiplicative impact that even small increases in funding allotment can have across numerous campus organizations and groups. Thus, the Committee felt that this information was a great basis for understanding the impact of increased funding.

Additionally, the committee felt as though the Funds Allotment Council has made significant strides towards internal improvement despite having no explicit recommendations made in the last OAF cycle. They have continued to improve their transparency through publishing their slate regularly and promptly, maintaining a user-friendly website, and continually working to increase awareness of the funding availability through publicity materials. The Funds Allotment Council has continually worked to improve their processes internally through an annual review of their internal procedures and made positive changes to improve their processes. They have additionally begun work with advisors to ensure their funding process holds up to legal standards.

Given the current fiscal situation of the University and student attitudes expressed throughout the findings process, the Committee was unable to fund their proposal fully. However, the Committee feels that the impact and leverage gained by even a small reallocation will have an impact on funding availability for student groups across campus and overall student satisfaction.

Recommendations from the Committee:

The Committee recommends that FAC proactively strive to reduce rollover on a semesterly basis. We acknowledge that some rollover is necessary and a product of normal

operation procedure. However, the Committee feels that further rollover management is critical to the efficient and effective use of the student fee.

Additionally, the Funds Allotment Council has expressed a desire to increase awareness and transparency on their definition of funding “meritability”. While FAC has explained this to groups that apply for funding, the Committee believes that continued efforts to educate the Student Association on how the designation is applied is important for future success of the organization.

Student Government

Recommendations from the Committee:

The Committee recommends no change in Student Government's current level of funding. Student Government consistently maintains a \$10,000 rollover. The Committee recommends that Student Government reevaluates their budget to use these funds. The Committee would like to see Student Government reduce the rollover to \$5,000 by the next OAF review period.

Previous OAF reports, including the 2013-2014 report, have repetitively noted problems with Student Government's visibility and transparency. While the Committee recognizes the improvements made, it continues to recommend that additional efforts should be made to increase student understanding and participation in Student Government.

To reach these goals, the Committee recommends that Student Government continues to make publicity improvements. This includes reinstating and enhancing Purple Friday, creating a set standard for tabling during election season, and improving Student Government's social media presence. To improve Student Government's social media awareness and presence, the Committee recommends that Student Government gives away prizes through social media as an incentive to follow Student Government's social media accounts.

It is of the utmost importance that Student Government improves its transparency. To promote transparency, the Committee recommends that Student Government creates a budget that shows both the allocated funds and the actual funds that were spent each semester. It is also recommended that this budget, along with all up to date resolutions, be posted on the Student Government website.

Student Government is the representative of all campus organizations; therefore, the Committee recommends that Student Government increases its involvement with campus organizations. To improve involvement with these organizations, it is recommended that Student Government assigns committees to check in on organizations twice a year. During these visits, Student Government can update organizations on what is going on in Student Government and the organizations can provide updates and feedback to Student Government.

To assist in the overall processes of Student Government, the Committee recommends that Student Government looks into ways to increase continuity between outgoing and incoming

executive and committee head positions. The Committee recommends that Student Government sets aside time during the fall retreat to review the spring report.

The Committee also notes some serious issues with Student Government's involvement in the OAF review process. No formal materials (other than previous OAF reports) are available to assist Student Government in the formation and approval of the fee review. Student Government is currently responsible for the formation of the Committee, financing the review process, and for the formal approval of the report. Although Student Government does not appear to have received preferential treatment by the Committee in the past few years, this complicated involvement could be ethically compromising. Student Government's current responsibility over the formation, funding, and approval of the OAF review is detrimental to the impartiality of the OAF review process. The Committee formally recommends that the Student Affairs Office take over the formation and, with the collaboration of the fee-based organizations, the financing of the review process. The document formalizing this separation is attached to the report in the Additional Documents section below.

In addition to the general recommendations above, the Committee was specifically concerned with the workings of the Appropriations Committee. We recommend that the application format is updated and that the committee is upfront about the information that they will need from the student organization. Additionally, we recommend that records of all appropriations be kept and publically stored.

One of our major concerns with this committee is the overlap that may be occurring in giving funds to student organizations by Appropriations, FAC, and even the Athletic Fee Committee. While we recognize the difference in nature between the types of fund allocation, we highly recommend that Student Government's Appropriations Committee work in congruence with FAC to ensure that they are not giving funds to student organizations disproportionately and ultimately empowering the Student Association to its fullest. One suggestion would be to include other funding as a question on the appropriations application.

Although not within the fee review years, in the 2016-2017 school year Student Government approved a change in their Standing Rules allowing the Appropriations Committee to allocate a maximum of \$650 per student organization each academic year, which is a significant decrease. The Committee ultimately saw this change favorably, however it will be important in the future to analyze whether Student Government is still be using their entire yearly budget with individual student organizations being allocated less total funds.

Collegiate Readership Program (CRP)

The Committee recommends a decrease of \$1.25 per student per semester (\$2.50 annually) to the Collegiate Readership Program portion of the Activities Fee. It must be noted that this is only sustainable until the next OAF period. This fee should be reevaluated during the next review because the surplus will no longer be able to subsidize the lack of funding from the fee itself.

The original establishment of the CRP fee was priced at an amount much larger than the actual cost of the program. Therefore, a large surplus built up over the years. The 2013-2014 Committee decreased this portion of the fee for the purpose of reducing that surplus. This reduction successfully cut the surplus by \$50,000. The CRP account currently has a \$73,000 surplus. Our current print investment is \$45,400 annually; this is divided between three newspapers. The USA Today at a rate of \$.55 per paper, The New York Times at a rate of \$1.00 per paper, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch at a rate of \$.40 cents per paper. Our digital investment in the program is currently \$9,000, but would raise to \$12,000 due to an increase in the cost of our App “The Buzz”.

Despite the positive outlook regarding our surplus, many students prioritize other aspects of the Activities Fee, such as FAC and SAB, over the CRP. Because of this, the Committee feels that we should be more aggressive with the reduction of this surplus. In addition to the \$1.25 semester decrease, we recommend eliminating the digital investment of the program, “The Buzz” App. Since the App was implemented in September of 2015 there have been 617 downloads. This is roughly 10% of the student population. Unfortunately, only 57 of those downloads have come from the 2016-2017 school year. There is an average of 10.77 launches daily, with each launch lasting an average of 82.33 seconds. The committee was not especially impressed with these statistics. Also, 80.6% of the respondents from our survey were not even aware “The Buzz” existed. In addition to these findings, of the 12 members of our focus group none currently had the App downloaded. After discussing it and its purpose, and the CRP in general, nobody intended to the download “The Buzz”.

The Committee is aware that Truman Media Network (TMN) has invested a lot of time and resources into “The Buzz”. Because of this relationship, TMN has requested the Committee consider giving a portion of the CRP fee to help support their operations, which provide the Student Association with high quality campus and local news. Despite this unique relationship, the Committee recommends that TMN pursue other outlets to receive funding. The nature of this fee is not to supplement a lack of funding in the Communication Department. The Committee

does believe that students of all majors are invested in TMN and gain valuable experience from their involvement. Despite the benefits of TMN, its purpose is not aligned with that of the CRP's.

Recommendations from the Committee:

In order for the CRP to be the most effective, we must ensure that students are the ones utilizing the papers. Unfortunately, Kirksville does not have any other resources that provided print versions of The New York Times newspaper. This specifically, has caused an issue with community members taking papers from inside buildings. The Committee highly recommends reevaluating the location of the papers to ensure students are the ones taking them. We want to be sure that this issue is pressured. There has been discussion of moving paper stands up to the 2nd floor in buildings such as Violette Hall, McClain Hall, and Ophelia Parrish. There is also the possibility of moving stands behind desks in the Residence Halls, the Student Union Building, and Pickler Memorial Library.

The Committee also proposed the idea of selling newspaper to staff and community members. This idea was not pursued much, but we believe it should be further.

Center for Student Involvement (CSI)

The Committee reviewed the current \$3.00 allotment of student funding with the Center for Student Involvement(CSI). The Committee met with representatives from the CSI Office on multiple occasions to clarify the fee usage and form recommendations. The Committee concluded that the help provided by CSI representatives was essential to the functioning of several student-fee based organizations, and thus felt the current appropriation was merited.

However, representatives from the fee-based organizations as well as the Students at Large that met with CSI officials felt that the organizations through the CSI Office had unrealistic workloads, which provided increased hardships for staff members and inhibited organizational functionality. While the Committee discussed alternatives that included a fee increase to bring in another full-time staff member to alleviate the workload, many complications with the suggestion arose, including concerns from current staff members.

Recommendations from the Committee

Thus, we recommend that the CSI Office consider the allotment of a GTRA position within the budget in order to increase efficiency and alleviate the workload placed on the current organizational liaisons. After careful consideration, the Committee feels that the availability of a position that carries greater compensation will lead to increased commitment from a student worker. The Committee recognizes the resource limitations of this proposal, but feels it would be an appropriate alternative for consideration for the CSI Office.

Environmental Sustainability Fee

The Student Association approved the Environmental Sustainability Fee (ESF) in the Spring of 2015 and went into effect in the Fall of 2015. The Fee is \$10 per academic year. The Environmental Sustainability Fee Accountability Committee takes ideas from the Student Association and proposes their own ideas for sustainability projects. The committee consists of a chair, three members of the Student Association, a representative selected by the Student Association President, a Student Government representative and three representatives from Truman's various environmental organizations. This committee will soon see new leadership. The long time committee chair has held this position since the creation of the fee, and it will be important to watch how the fee adapts to new leadership.

Recommendations from the Committee

The current OAF Committee focuses its recommendations around implementation, considering that the Sustainability Fee is fairly new and more data needs to be gathered in order to accurately assess this fee. Since this fee has the resources to make changes on campus through large and small projects, the OAF Committee recommends that it should do so to increase the longevity of Truman. Projects like the solar panels on the University Farm and reusable water bottle fountains are both examples of influential long term projects. Additionally, the ESF Accountability Committee should publicize projects in order to raise awareness for their work. The committee could utilize the Student Government website or put up plaques in order to indicate which environmentally friendly projects it has sponsored.

Additional Recommendations

The OAF Committee has three additional recommendations that do not directly relate to a fee:

1. The Committee recommends it be established every three years by the Student Affairs Office. The topic of separating from Student Government due to conflicts of interest and possible ethical issues has been discussed in the Student Government section of this report. Here, we clarify that Student Affairs will provide an official advisor for the Committee who will assist in establishing methodology and committee procedures. In addition to this advisor, the Committee must work with the CSI Office to gather information from its staff. Our Committee found that the insight gained from the Fee-Based organization advisors was crucial in understanding the complexity of their organizations. This relationship must not compromise the ethical standards of the review of the CSI office itself.

This switch will be in collaboration with the fee-based organizations. The Committee shall continue to consist of members of all of the fee based organizations, a member of the Athletics Fee Committee, a member of the Environmental Sustainability Fee Committee, and Student Association representatives. This committee shall evaluate this process and make suggestions for future committees. Future committees should work to write formalized standing rules for the OAF review process, and provide recommendations to improve the impartiality of the Committee.

2. The OAF Committee recommends requiring each organization and committee submit budgets with the following information:

- Year
- Allotment
- Actual spent
- Amount from rollover

See the sample attached for appropriate documentation. This is only a minimum requirement. It is encouraged to provide additional information, graphs, and charts. The Committee also recommends publishing this information on each respective website yearly. The Environmental Sustainability and Athletic Fee budgets should be posted on the Student Government website. OAF is aware that the organizations already do this and the Committee appreciates that. We mention this to ensure this precedent continues and continues with a high quality.

3. The Committee recommends the establishment of a “Response day”. This event would be put on in the SUB each fall before winter break to give students the chance to comment on and learn about the 3 Fee-Based organizations. Even though students have the ability to do this

year-round through other means, the Committee believes that this will reach more students. Each Organization will set up a station and have members present at all times to answer questions. The Committee has not set a specific structure for this day, so it will be the responsibility of the leadership in each organization to come together and do so. This could require a “Response Day” committee be formed with a representative from each organization. Given that the nature of each organization is very different, Student Government, SAB, and FAC will likely gather slightly different information from this day. Regardless, this will increase transparency of the organizations and increase student involvement with student funds.

Conclusions

The Committee of the 2016-2017 academic year worked tirelessly for nearly five months over the span of both semesters to ensure the fee assessment process was fair, accurate, and effective at making Truman State University a more stable and welcoming place for students. The Spring Survey and focus groups allowed the committee to get a better idea of how the Student Association felt about these fees in general, as well as opinions on how these student fees should be delegated. With the aforementioned in mind, the committee has made the above recommendations after months of analysis and deliberation.

An additional executive report will be published by the Committee Chair, Kailey Micek, by the end of the 2016-2017 school year. This report will share experiences and give recommendations for the structure of future OAF committees.

To view the electronic version of this document please visit senate.truman.edu

Additional Documents

OAF Spring 2017 Survey Results:

https://docs.google.com/a/truman.edu/document/d/1JXkPnsW8qgca_zw187UMC8hWV46CSsR68GffKE4so9s/edit?usp=sharing

Resolution Untying the Athletic Fee from CPI:

<https://docs.google.com/a/truman.edu/document/d/1dS658IBgWMNG5pAE2Dp7xyw3YYEM0cwisiCJnV5fHyA/edit?usp=sharing>

Resolution Separating the OAF Review Committee from Student Government:

https://docs.google.com/a/truman.edu/document/d/1HfcKQpASuddWICVOiUpv_SrTTv_eUb2OLqp7cWdCLBzU/edit?usp=sharing

Resolution Eliminating “The Buzz”:

https://docs.google.com/a/truman.edu/document/d/1K_phiSyG9_cFaHvGUk9yCAEvaf12NVOQ3C420ddlc8/edit?usp=sharing

Example Budget:

https://docs.google.com/a/truman.edu/spreadsheets/d/12ywhR8DRHvh79ETPiRcw_ytG9pUeXIRCzC6GFS0vBDs/edit?usp=sharing