In Chair Payne’s absence Ona Tolliver called the meeting to order at 11:10 a.m.

Ona Tolliver announced that after budget authorities present provide information regarding the requests submitted the committee will discuss the allocation of additional funds that have become available to allocate. Ona Tolliver announced that the Business Affairs office in conjunction with Dr. Mabry have been reviewing salaries to see what can be moved to other funding sources. VPBA Jesse Acosta confirmed that the salary (including fringe benefits & longevity) for the Veteran’s Resource Center coordinator has been moved to designated tuition and that additional salaries are still being evaluated by Business Affairs.

Ona Tolliver announced that VPSA Howard Patterson has submitted a request to the committee that will need to be reviewed that moves partial funding for his Sr. Administrative Associate to Student Service Fee funding. These changes will net the committee approximately $15,000 additional dollars bringing the total available for on-going allocation to approximately $23,000.

Ona Tolliver asked the budget authorities present to provide information they have. Jennifer Skinner has sent her information for review by the committee as she is at a conference though she has offered to Skype in to the next meeting if necessary.

Ona invited budget authorities to discuss questions asked at the previous meeting.

*From March 20th meeting minutes: Follow-up question (Learning Communities): The committee will ask the budget authority to attend the next meeting to provide additional information on what Learning Communities are on this campus and how they serve our students.*

Ashley Ward provided the committee with a handout (Appendix A) and discussed the SLC program. Ashley Ward shared that the Learning Community takes incoming freshman with a common major or common interest and blocks them together in courses they are required to take or interested in along with common core curriculum. These students enroll in 2 courses together and a UNIV 0 credit course where they meet with a faculty/staff mentor (next year with a peer mentor as well in coordination with Student Life & Leadership). In this UNIV course the students learn about a large area of campus resources (social and academic). Through this program the University is making sure freshmen are working to get involved in campus, and learning how to make a difference; they learn about time management, note taking, test anxiety, etc. The program gives them information up front so they don’t have to seek that information out and provides them connections in their freshman year which helps retain them. Learning Communities have an 86% on average fall to fall retention rates compared to 67% average for the rest of their freshmen cohort and slightly increased gpa (.3 - .4 above freshman average). This fall the increased number of PASSages students (those who were admitted but do not technically reach admissions standards) increased which decrease the Learning community enrollment. In Fall 2014, the program is going to pilot 3-4 learning communities that are attached to common interest/common major along with the Peer mentor student connection and will piloting a new learning community for transfer students.
Jesse Acosta asked: how does this differ from the Freshman Year Experience program? Ashley Ward stated that we’re working with this program in the next academic year to be sure we are not duplicating efforts. Ashley stated that her office sees a captive audience in the UNIV class and a peer mentors will be supporting these efforts. Ona Tolliver state that the Patriot Freshmen Connection program was always in addition to other existing programs such as the honors programs, athletic mentoring programs, etc. that are used to connect freshmen to a specific area. She stated that the Patriot Freshmen Connection program is used to develop a higher level of interaction with those students and support those affinity groups and does not away for programs offered to students but adds a second level of support to programs.

Jesse Acosta stated that he sees 2 funding sources for the same ‘peer mentor’ programs for both freshmen and transfers. Ona Tolliver stated that the current funds that are set aside for transfer orientation are insufficient for additional programs and next step for freshmen engagement programs is to connect them in their 2nd semester and beyond. Ashley Ward stated that Student Life & Leadership & Academic Success have met and continue to meet to discuss that we’re not duplicating efforts, and that that we’re serving the entire student populations (UNIV class through a captive audience vs. the remainder of freshmen that are being supported primarily by the Patriot Freshman Connection program). Ona Tolliver confirmed that in the end these different student to student mentoring programs will be named something similar but won’t be duplicated in name.

The committee confirmed they had no additional questions. Ashley Ward left the meeting at 11:23 a.m.

From March 20th meeting minutes: Follow-up question (Patriot Center): The committee will invite the budget authority to the next meeting to discuss why this account is funded from student service fees rather than the recreational facility fee.

Bob Hepler informed the committee that the current Rec Sports full time employees are not all able to support Rec Sports time as many have other job responsibilities support Athletics or coaching and that the Patriot Center does an incredible amount with very little compared to other local universities including Texas A&M commerce (which has significantly more staffing), Tartleton State (which has a higher budget), etc. The Patriot Center has seen right at about 100,000 student visits each year and projected to be over 130,000 card swipes this year. Bob Hepler indicated that a very strong case could be made that UT Tyler has the lowest rec sports fees across the state of Texas and has seen no rec facility fee increase in the 10 years Bob Hepler has been here. Dr. Patterson clarified that rates dictated by Texas Education Code 54.5341 for this facility (http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.54.htm#54.5341) have never increased in history of the program. Bob Hepler informed the committee that based on the NIRSA standards a facility this size should serve a population of about 3,000 to 4,000 students. He shared that the facility has to rely heavily on students staffing and wages for this year are projected to be more than $130,600. Bob Hepler confirmed that this Student Service Fee account is used primarily to off-set the rising cost of student employment and that the Patriot Center has tried new initiatives this year to cut costs including reducing holiday hours drastically. He informed the committee that the Budget Office has approved a projected budget with increased funding of $30,000 for the Rec Facility Fee which alleviates some of the increase wages in FY15 and that in the summer there is a good amount of income but basically all that money goes to the student wage line is already in the red. There were a number of UT Tyler students that are local or live on campus and they have been furious at the limited holiday hours so the Patriot Center continues to look for ways to serve those students when we are on break.

Jesse Acosta asked if the Patriot Center staff was aware of other institutions that have an automatically escalating fee.

Jameson Adams answered that some operate with an ability to increase their fee without a student vote and increase their fees by that amount or less (typically no more than 10%).
NOTE: Texas Education Code 54.5341 details the required steps to increase the Rec Facility fee at UT Tyler and this information was provided to the committee in their binders and reviewed at the February 27th introductory meeting. A link is provided for additional reference: http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.54.htm#54.5341

Jesse Acosta informed the committee that any increases in specific fees reduces the amount that we can increase tuition which is a more general fund per the guidelines the Board of Regents provided. Jesse Acosta is working to review and clean up what fees fund what areas and what items can be funded from designated tuition or other sources.

Bob Hepler informed the committee that he would much rather use the Patriot Center Student Service Fee account to support new equipment purchases and has asked through separate budget hearings for this funding. Chauncey Deller stated that ever every effort is made to generate revenue and the Patriot Center goes out in to the community to sell memberships, etc but that can take away from the student experience and space that students could otherwise use.

Jesse Acosta asked if the new Athletics Development Officer will be able to assist with these funds or if that position will be more project based and Howard Patterson confirmed that the Development Officer will currently complete mostly project based fundraising for now.

From March 20th meeting minutes: Follow-up question (Intramurals): The committee would like to invite the budget authority to come to the next meeting to how they are utilizing the account and to provide a more detailed breakdown of the accounts allocations.

Bob Hepler asked for clarification regarding the discussion surrounding the intramural question

Ona Tolliver confirmed that there was a committee member that felt that the students recognition wasn’t consist and was not significant enough as all the winners received was a t-shirt. Katy Cline confirmed that the committee requested a detailed breakdown of the allocations (including M&O) as it was not provided on the original form.

Jameson Adams stated that if you are looking at the M&O line specifically and what has been spent over the last 2 years a significant amount of the funds have gone to purchasing the 500 t-shirts necessary for prizes in each Intramural area. He informed the committee that if we were to increase the award to something more substantial or something with a higher perceived value but with a limited increased cost we would utilize all of M&O, leaving no funds for equipment purchases. He stated that with our participation going up we’re going through equipment a lot faster so equipment cost is increasing.

NOTE: Bob Hepler provided the following breakdown for the committee’s review via e-mail March 26th:

IM M&O-$4000
Championship T-Shirts -$2600
IM event T-shirts-$600
IM Marketing Materials-$250
Officials Training Material-$250
Replacement of existing equipment-$300
Softballs-$125
Basketballs-$75
Footballs-$50
Volleyballs-$50
Jameson Adams informed the committee that it is standard practice throughout NIRSA to provide a t-shirt to Intramural winners and while he would love to give trophies to everyone the budget doesn’t allow for that.

Bob Hepler shared that this fall and spring Jameson Adams has had to close down registration for some events because there simply isn’t a budget to support nor is there location (Flag football has limited staffing, limited facilities, etc). Jameson Adams confirmed that and added that in the past UT Tyler charged a small fee (cost only) for Intramurals and provided jersey’s for flag football but saw a significant increase in teams when they didn’t required jerseys and therefore didn’t charge per team registration fee. Jameson Adams summarized that on this campus there would be a decrease in participation if there is a fee but it is a direction the department could be heading if it needed to.

Jesse Acosta stated that these sound like popular programs and asked if there was enough space for them?

Jameson Adams confirmed that there is not enough space for all that our students are interested in. The current programs pick and choose their schedule based around the availability of the athletic fields, events and schedules. Jameson Adams confirmed that if there was double the space in a certain configuration more could be accomplished. He shared that through this committee lights were added to the intramural fields, and the gymnasium in the PHE was partially funded but that the programs are outgrowing space, especially outdoor.

Jesse Acosta shared that students have asked for the University to do something intentional for Village at the U and that any intentional modifications to the area across the street would be to address these concerns. Jesse Acosta asked if outdoor basketball courts could help the current issue; Jameson Adams said they are not conducive for 5 v 5 but could be helpful for a 3 v 3 or 2 v 2 intramural league.

Kay Pleaseant asked if you expand intramurals would you need to expand staffing? Bob Hepler confirmed that would be necessary and that the Intramurals has submitted to the President a list of potential fields across the street – one would be a larger field where you could do larger events (softball, etc.) and the other a smaller soccer size field to host a variety of intramurals (flag football, etc.)

The committee confirmed they had no additional questions. Bob Hepler, Jameson Adams, Amanda Davis & Chauncey Deller left the meeting at 11:41 a.m.

*From March 20th meeting minutes: Follow-up questions (Student Activities):* The committee will ask the budget authority to provide a detailed account of how funds were used for the last 2-3 years along with event attendance to see how it correlates to enrollment increases. The committee will invite the budget authority to the next meeting to discuss structure of the Campus Activities Board and survey information from events if provided.

Jennifer Skinner provided information for the committee to review (Appendix B) and Ona Tolliver explained the format of the Annual Report to the committee on Jennifer Skinner’s behalf. Ona Tolliver informed the committee that all areas that report to her are required to compile and submit annual reports that outline an areas mission statement, their TracDat learning outcomes and goals and objectives, programs, staff development, etc. She stated that under programs you see the list of events, budget, how the event supports back to outcomes, attendance, who was the sponsor of events (campus activities vs cab) which is a lot of the details the committee has asked for.

Howard Patterson noted that attendance should be noted as estimated attendance (rather than exact attendance as the numbers are rounded); Ona Tolliver clarified that in some cases those number are the
exact number of meals ordered or novelty items paid for so round number are correct but that moving forward that change can be made.

Jesse Acosta commented that the outcomes appear the same for all activities as does the marketing for most of them which could make the data appear less accurate; Ona Tolliver clarified that for the outcomes these events have to be accurately recorded so each event may actually pertain to every listed outcome but that suggested change can be incorporated into the format of annual reports at the end of the year.

Ona Tolliver invited committee members to review the following e-mailed responses provided by budget authorities to inquiries from the March 20th meeting.

*From March 20th meeting minutes: Follow up question (Co-curricular): The committee will ask the budget authority if any of these funds are used to support faculty travel on these trips or if faculty travel is funded by the departments.*

*Response received via e-mail from Rick Peterson:* Faculty travel expenses are not allowed to be paid from co-curricular funds. Each department has to fund any accompanying faculty member’s expenses. Faculty members are sometimes reimbursed for student expenses if incurred but not the faculty member’s expenses. Example: a faculty member pays for student registration fees on their personal credit card.

The only thing that would get close to including a faculty member’s expense on co-curricular funds would be that the faculty member is the driver for the rental car that is hauling the students. The full rental car expense is billed to co-curricular funds. We don’t divide up the % of the rental among the vehicle occupants.

*From March 20th meeting minutes: Follow up question (Debate): The committee will ask the budget authority to provide an itemized breakdown of how the account is used including the tournaments they compete in and number of students that travel to or complete in each as well as what other means of funding they have and what forms of fundraising they do.*

*Response received via e-mail from Charles Walts:* We do receive funding from the President’s discretionary account, and that money is used for scholarship for the debaters. Our major cost to the program is travel. From the budget spreadsheet you can see that travel costs a significant amount. Unfortunately, we can only minimize costs so much due to annual airline fee increases and inflationary pressure on the dollar.

We do not do any fundraising. A cursory overview of the budget provides a good rationale for why. First, the amount of fundraising we would have to do to cover our costs would be extreme and there is little benefit to the hours fundraising would take to generate a relatively low return. Second, the time we spend preparing for each tournament is the equivalent of having a fulltime job. It is not unusual for the coaches and debaters to spend evenings and weekends when we are not traveling practicing for the next tournament. I do not know where we could fit in a fundraising event that would a) generate the needed revenue and b) wouldn’t significantly tradeoff with tournament preparation and hinder our performance.

I think the best way to conceptualize our budgetary is that we have several fixed costs (airlines, per diem, hotels, and registration fees) that are only on the upswing. In order to be competitive we have to debate the programs that at the top of the national rankings and there is little to no opportunity to do that without flying to where those tournaments occur. If one where to breakdown the budget via cost per student, it might seem like we spend more per student than events cost on campus, but using that calculus would create a large budgetary bias against programs like debate, model UN and other activities that spend a large portion of their budget on travel.

See Appendix C for Debate detailed budget provided by Teran Jeffery.
From March 20th meeting minutes: **Follow-up question (Student Government Association):** The committee will confirm with the budget authority whether there are any other reasons that the officer position funding was changed to hourly or if it is exclusively because of PeopleSoft.

**Response received via e-mail from Adrian Lodge:** There were no reasons other than PeopleSoft for changing the officer funding to hourly. Their payment breakdown is explained in the MOPP: http://www.uttyler.edu/mopp/4StudentGovernmentAssociation%20.pdf. Please let me know if you or the SFAC has any additional questions.

Ona Tolliver informed the committee that she will touch base with our students who are not here and make sure that they are up to speed and committed to participating in the remainder of the process. She recapped that at our last meeting we were only able to identify $8,121 in available funding but since then with the commitment made by VPBA Jesse Acosta to move the Veteran’s Resource Center professional salary, fringe and benefits to designated tuition and the request from VPSA Howard Patterson to move 2/3 of the salary funding of his Sr. Administrative Associate to fee funding the committee will have a total of $23,000 or slightly above to allocate to on-going requests.

Ona Tolliver asked committee members to modify their prioritize their lists for on-going funding prior to our next meeting where we will review budget requests based on the additional allocations for on-going expenses.

Kim Harvey Livingston asked if there is any new information regarding available one-time funding.

Jesse Acosta indicated that the President approves one-time funding specifically from the reserves and that the student fee committee is entitled to ask for funding from that account. Jesse Acosta advised that the committee should include approved requests for use of one-time funding from the reserve with their recommendations of on-going funding to the President for FY15.

Ona Tolliver confirmed that all current budget requests before the committee can be consider as one time funding from reserve requests with the exception of salary requests and asked the committee to prepare a second priority list of one time funding items to review at the next meeting.

Ona Tolliver adjourned the meeting at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Katy Cline
Student Learning Community Overview

What is a Student Learning Community?
Student Learning Communities are small groups of students with a common major or interest that take one core course and a freshman success seminar together. Student Learning Community students have the opportunity to quickly make friends and develop close relationships with UT Tyler faculty and staff.

What is covered in a Freshman Success Seminar?
Students learn about academic integrity, information ethics, critical thinking skills, the promotion of educational values, and the development of skills and attitudes necessary for a satisfactory college experience. In addition, it provides students with information on campus resources, assists them in laying the groundwork for choosing a major and planning a career, eases the transition from high school to college, and generally helps the students feel connected to campus.

Freshman Success Seminar is designed to:
- Provide strategies to help students set realistic, attainable goals
- Assist students in developing the professional and academic skills that will enable them to attain their professional goals
- Identify campus resources and support networks facilitating academic, professional, and personal growth
- Identify out-of-classroom campus opportunities and experiences that support educational and professional goals
- Facilitate understanding of the relationship between social responsibility, community service, and professional development
- Show the value of working and interacting with people of different cultures on campus and in the work force.

Why join a Learning Community?
Participants in the Learning Community programs can expect:
- Increased academic success
- Introduction to academic and social resources
- Participation in programs and events
- Close relationships with University faculty and staff
- A close network of peers
- A small, comfortable learning environment
- Guest speakers from the University and local community
- A more positive freshman year experience

Student Learning Community Results
- The SLC program tracks student participation, student satisfaction, GPA and one year retention rates of SLC participants.
- Approximately 20% of the Fall 2012 freshman cohort enrolled in an SLC.
- Fall 2012 SLC participants showed an 83% retention rate from fall to fall as compared to a 67% retention rate for the freshman cohort.
- The mean GPA of SLC participants exceeded that of non-participants with a 3.06 compared to 2.82.
- Finally, of the students who participated in the SLC program, 86% rated their overall satisfaction of their SLC experience in the “good” to “excellent” category.
Appendix B – provided by Jennifer Skinner via excel spreadsheet.

Tabs 5 & 6 are copied below (CAB Structure Info & Satisfaction Results). Tabs 1 – 4 of Annual Report data were loaded for detailed committee review in BlackBoard.

CAB Structure Info

**CAB Mission**
The Campus Activities Board (CAB) is dedicated to promoting involvement and unity among students, faculty, and staff at the University of Texas at Tyler and to the development of student leaders. We achieve this mission by developing and sponsoring entertaining, cultural, educational, and recreational programs and activities for the campus community.

**CAB Officer Description**
President: Conduct Meetings; Oversee function of CAB; Advisor Liason

Vice President: Maintains paperwork/files; Evaluation coordinator; Member recognition

Event Manager: Staffing of events; Recruit volunteers; Setup; Food for events

Marketing Manager: Maintains Marketing calendar; Design of marketing

Public Relations/Communicaitons: Distribution of Marketing; Social Media manager

Meetings & Membership Manager: Meeting agendas; Sign-in binder; Meeting activities; Member communications

**Types of Events**

Concerts & Comedians: Open Mic Nights, Tunes @ Noon, Concerts, Comedy Nights, etc.

Novelties: Photobooths, Skating rinks, Stamp-a-Ring, License Plates & Street Signs, etc.

Late Night & Weekends: Sporting Events off campus, Carnivals, Casino Nights, etc.

Movies: Movie nights, Movie marathons, etc.

**How an event is chosen**
Students who meet criteria set by the board and advisor are invited to attend a programming conference in the Fall where they see numerous acts in all types of categories, where they decide as a group if they are interested in bringing that person to campus. The advisor then tries to book that artist or novelty in a block with nearby schools in order to get the lowest possible rate and save the University as much money as possible. Once the conference is concluded, the students who attended the event will then show the other members who they voted on to bring to campus and they as a whole give final approval to request a contract for an artist or novelty. There are events that require no contract and those events are decided upon as a whole by the general membership of CAB--these events are things like Bingo, Game Night, etc.
## Satisfaction Results

### 2010-2011 Satisfaction Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall satisfaction with this program (5-point Likert Scale)</th>
<th>Number of Surveys</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Very Poor)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Poor)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Fair)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Good)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Very Good)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2011-2012 Satisfaction Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall satisfaction with this program (5-point Likert Scale)</th>
<th>Number of Surveys</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Very Poor)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Poor)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Fair)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Good)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Very Good)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>204</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2012-2013 Satisfaction Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall satisfaction with this program (5-point Likert Scale)</th>
<th>Number of Surveys</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Very Poor)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Poor)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Fair)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Good)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Very Good)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>156</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C – provided by Teran Jeffery via excel spreadsheet.

Tabs 1 is copied below (Overview). Tabs 2 – 8 of individual trip data were loaded for detailed committee review in BlackBoard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Fees Travel (75)</th>
<th>M&amp;O (50)</th>
<th>Grad Assist. (20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$3,762.00</td>
<td>$5,265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tournaments:**
- Jewell
- L&C
- McKendree
- Washburn
- Tournament X
- Mile High
- Loma
- UTTyler
- Nationals

**Key:**
- **Location:**
  - Jewell: Liberty, MO
  - L&C: Portland, OR
  - McKendree: Lebanon, IL
  - Washburn: Topeka, KS
  - Mile High: Salt Lake City, UT
  - Loma: San Diego, CA
  - Nationals: Flagstaff, AZ

- **Dates:**
  - Jewell: 9/19-9/23/13
  - L&C: 10/10-10/14/13
  - McKendree: 10/17-10/21/13
  - Washburn: 11/14-11/18/13
  - Mile High: 1/17-1/21/14
  - Loma: 1/30-23/14
  - Nationals: 3/15(?)-3/24/14(?)

- **Airport:**
  - Jewell: MCI
  - L&C: PDX
  - McKendree: STL
  - Washburn: MCI
  - Mile High: SLC
  - Loma: SAN
  - Nationals: PHX