

Incidental Fee Committee Emergency Meeting #2 Minutes

Monday, November 23, 2020 | 11:00 AM

Via Zoom (link in Calendar invite)

Makana Waikiki in Chair

Minutes

1. Call to Order

- Meeting was called to order by Makana Waikiki at 11:04 AM.

2. Approval of the agenda – Agreed to as written as per Makana.

3. Roll Call (name, pronouns, position)

- IFC Members: Makana Waikiki, IFC Chair, Nick Denning, IFC Vice Chair, Quentin Kanta, IFC Member, Kayley Arpaia, IFC Member, Carlos Fonseca Jr., IFC Member, Juliana Cameron, IFC Member,
- Advisors: David McDonald, Darin Silbernagel, sitting in for Ana Karaman, Gary Dukes is unable to join today.
- Area Heads: NJ Johnson, ASWOU President representing ASWOU, Megan Habermann is here for Patrick Moser representing Student Engagement and Student Media, Randi Lydum, Athletics, Rip Horsey with Campus Recreation, David Janowiak with Creative Arts, Tammy Gardner, representing Child Development Center.
- Other Representatives: President Rex Fuller, President of Western Oregon University. Liz Marquez, ASWOU President, Chris Smith, ASWOU Director of State and Federal Affairs, Sydney Carpenter, News Editor for the Western Howl, Steven Richmond, ASWOU Judicial Administrator.
- IFC Secretary, unable to attend.

New Business

- Discussion with President Fuller

- Makana had reached out to set this meeting last week. Nick reached out over the weekend. He has a meeting and can only be with us until 12:00pm. He would rather answer questions versus doing a presentation. He and NJ Johnson made a presentation last week to the BOT.
- Makana opened the meeting up to questions.
- Quentin thanked President for being here today. He began with the most pressing question. The IFC Committee has requested to meet with the Board of Trustees in December to discuss charging an incident fee during winter term so we do not miss the deadline to charge and collect that fee. Chair Comp rejected this request without providing any sort of reasoning to us. We see this as yet another violation of our ORS 352 105. Would you personally urge the Board of Trustees to meet during December to uphold your legal obligations under that statute?
- President Fuller said that the presentation given last week made it very clear what the Board's roll in this process is. They've delegated quite a bit of that consulting to him, as president. That's clear from the presentation NJ and he made. There were really no questions about the process of ORS and how it works on this campus and the IFC process as we've defined it. I consult with the Board chair on special sessions as she requests. I can call her later today and express your desire to have a special session in December. The first request to meet with her was sent several weeks ago to have a special session, he would have to check his emails for the exact date. He can do what he did with NJ, which was meet last week and give a presentation that clearly defines the roll of ASWOU and the student body and the roll of IFC as delegated by ASWOU in this process. He thought this was clearly understood. He will meet with NJ to see what his perspective on this is. That was his perspective from the last WebX call.
- NJ: That was the goal of our joint presentation and he thinks they did a good job of accomplishing their goal in bringing the board up to speed on

our process. He thinks that being said though, the IFC still has their fee request for winter term and that they would like to have reviewed by the board for winter term. They want to do due diligence to their process and get as much student fee back as the bylaws require without skipping steps and without students not having a chance to have a say in their fee and that a decision is being rushed. That is why Makana made the request to Chair Comp and the Board of Trustees and gave the request of 35 days to schedule this emergency meeting. There is the issue of our process but there also is the issue of the actual fee request being made by IFC is interested and that that they are making for winter 20201.

- Quentin: Rephrasing his request he would like on behalf of the committee o request that President Fuller urge Chair Comp to honor that request that she call an emergency meeting in December. We were going to initially told that the Board of Trustee's was no allowed to do that, but upon rereading their bylaws and they specifically are allowed to call a special meeting and the committee feels this would be an appropriate usage of that clause in their bylaws. We respectfully request that you urge her to honor that request when you speak with her later today.
- President Rex Fuller: He will talk with her and give her your thoughts. His experience with Board Chairs, they are well aware of their responsibility and their needs. He will give her a sense of urgency on your request and will communicate that with her later today.
- Makana added that there was no explanation given except to say that meeting was out of the question and can't be done. The IFC would like to have something in writing what the reasoning would be so we can fully understand this decision. If you could please pass that on, President Fuller, to the Chair, that would be wonderful.
- Kayley: In addition, could you (President Fuller) directly express that you are in support of holding that emergency meeting? You mentioned that you would pass on our request, but if you could expressly be in favor of us

having that meeting and if you would be willing to express that position to Chair Comp.

- President Fuller: Before he could express if he is in favor of the meeting, he would need to see exactly what the request is. He has had be advised by people several folks like NJ around the ideas that have been explored by the IFC as well as a special committee. He has been clear in his meetings with NJ that he is not supportive of changing the fee structure in the middle of an academic term as a general rule. He would need to see more of the argument for the resolution or the recommendation that you are proposing. He has not seen a clear and definitive argument that you want the board to consider. What he has seen are ideas ranging from (depends on which time of the year) he will call them fees on all students ranging from low numbers to more recently high numbers. He has not seen a single actual proposal so he can't weigh in until he does. With the revisor that he is not in favor of changing fees mid-stream. It is clear to him for ORS that this body has the ability to change fees going forward but it's not clear if you have the ability to change it mid-stream. That's why he wrote to NJ on November 3 that they have an interim plan like they did for fall term and for winter term to be able to have the level of support needed for the IFC areas.
- Quentin: You mentioned several times that you (President Fuller) and other advisors on the call don't wish to change the fee structure at this time in the middle of the term however it is the opinion of the committee that you've put your yourself in this position. This is now 2 terms in a row that you and your administration have now blocked our attempts to institute a fee. Normally an incidental fee would be charged during this term. This is an unprecedented situation where you are saying you don't want to alter the fee structure in the middle of a term, typically we would be changing a fee and it is not the responsibility of the Incidental Fee Committee that we are not charging that fee, because the IFC Special Committee over the summer did push hard to be able to charge that fee

and are doing so for winter term. He would like to President Fuller elaborate on why you think we are in this situation and why you oppose our efforts to get back to the normal situation of charging the fee.

- President Fuller: The special committee over the summer did their work without consultation. We are applying the fees as we always have historically. The fees are applied to students who take courses face to face format. When you say I am responsible for doing this, he is certainly responsible for the decisions we make and it's been in response to COVID crisis we have, and to pivot away from face to face instruction to online instruction. To his knowledge they have never charged the incidental fee to online students. Students are charged a tech fee. We have used that tech fee funding to backfill the money we would otherwise generated had we been in a more normal circumstance. From a funding perspective, we have used the tech fee as a way of funding what we would have collected and we followed our normal policy to apply those fees to face to face enrollments. Darin is on the call and has a long history of how we apply the fee historically and it's my understand that we have never charge the incidental fee to students taking online classes.
- Darin: We have never charged an incidental fee to online students to the best of his knowledge in the last 30 years. He would like to clarify that even though we have had to modify the fee structure this past year we have reduced the tuition by \$52 per credit and put a \$53-dollar tech fee in place so it's really a wash except for the one dollar. And again, we have not had one in the past so hopefully that clarifies that issue. The other thing, if I could really quickly go to a question in the chat. There was a question about faculty pay. There are no faculty paid from IFC funds, but maybe it was referencing staff? He wanted to clarify that.
- Quentin: Obviously we've never charged the incidental fee to online students, but we've also obviously never had 95% of our students taking only online courses in the past. The committee is feeling frustrated that this is your defense against that. It feels like a little bit of a cop out given

the fact that none of us have chosen to be moved online like that all of the sudden. Personally, I support taking online courses, knowing it's safer that way, but I also think it's the responsible decision to allow this committee to alter our plans just like the university has altered it's plans in regards to COVID.

- Juliana: Following up on Quentin's question. President Fuller has expressed that he is not in favor of changing the fee structure mid-year. She wanted to understand your reasoning. You are in favor of charging a tech fee that we, as students have no autonomy over, how much we are being charged or what that's for. This is our process. The incidental fee is a fee have the ability to have control over. If it's not typically charged to online students, why are you more in favor of changing the fee structure and not charging the student body as a whole and instead use a subsidy from the tech fee?
- President Fuller responded saying that the process is not always in our review screen all the time. Setting up Residential Undergraduate tuition is under his house bill 4141 which requires a technology or tuition advisory committee, this campus has historically done even before that house bill was passed. While its primary charge is to identify the residential undergraduate tuition rate, it's also considers all the fees and all the different cost associated with attending campus as it tried to deliberate and set this. Including the myriad of fees including the incidental fees and identify this. That all goes to the Board of Trustees and in the April, meeting is put on it's docket. In the tuition and fee book, in this tuition and fee book is the residential undergraduate tuition which is the primary question before the BOT. There is a 5% primary limit as per the statute on that but also in that is a request or an identification for that online fee which was established at that time. So, when we look at the entire tuition and fee structure, you will see there is a system of fees. As Darin indicated that it was built in the current cycle as part of a total system for the total amount of fees that was reviewed and approved by the Board of

Trustees. This was also reviewed and approved by his Vice President of Finance and Administration. The residential undergraduate tuition is one that is one that House Bill 4141 that the tuition and advisory committee makes a recommendation on to the Board of Trustees that they reviewed and approved.

- Nick Denning: Thank you Dr. Fuller for being here and answering these questions. First question is about the fee system and the fees that are charged to students. This was talked about previously by David and then Darin. The online tech fee was specifically, the amount of it was specifically designed to offset the amount the university was losing by not charging the incidental fee. He was pretty sure that this was the \$52 verses \$53 amount that Darin was talking about. So, a student that was coming to the university in previous years was normally paying an incidental fee because they were attending in person classes. And now because they are not paying that fee due to not attending in person classes, the tech fee was raised to keep student paying a similar amount due to attending an in-person class or online. It sounds like Darin has something to say, but before that. specifically, from a student's point of view, the substitution from an incidental fee to a tech fee, in paying a tech fee even if it's the same cost, \$52 or \$53 for credit, we do not have autonomy over that money. So even though the cost is about the same, it's being used for completely different purposes. That is the most important thing as a student perspective. Less to do with the amount we pay of those two fees and more to do with that we get to choose what to do with that money as a student body. We want to differential between the autonomy that students have over the money that we are spending to attend this university. His second thing has to do with President Fuller not being in favor of changing the fee structure mid-stream. During the IFC special process, we met the summer before fall term, and were working out a way to charge online students the incidental fee. You know that, and said we were working not in consultation with the Board. He wanted to

remind President Fuller that the only people that can determine whether that is true or not is the Higher Education Coordination Committee.

President Fuller made an agreement with us to subsidize us one million dollars in exchange for not taking you to court regarding the HECC. What you just said has no legal standing right now, whether or not it will in the future, I can't say. What you said is not a fact. It's ambiguous to say if we were doing that in consultation with the Board, which is pretty important.

- Darin: The tuition was reduced and the fee put in place in lieu of. It has never been related to IFC. We did that for reasons and it was a whole group of folks that studied it. It was trying to get all the tuition even across the board. We've always had special technology needs that the tuition was covering before that it's now being called out separate. It was for putting online courses for. It's a mix but it was never IFC funds before, it was tuition. It supports the general fund.
- President Fuller: Regarding that we aren't collecting the IFC fee as we had thought we would when we planned in the budget back in March of last year because we pivoted to online classes almost exclusively. I think we all know that and that is why I agreed to provide one million dollars for fall to backfill for the amount collected. That is why I wrote to NJ on November 3 offering to do similar approach for winter term. Once we made the decision due to the disease, we have had to pivot once again to online courses. Those are in good faith to provide everyone with funding needed for essential services and for those who are in need now that we are on campus. We have 700 students who are in the residence halls on campus and in apartments compared to our approximate 1,100. That's 60% of what we normal activity. Regrettably that does affect our ability to have business as normal. All we have to look at the freeze on gyms and recreations centers around the state of Oregon to see those are closed for 2 weeks. All these things are what we are having to adapt to because of this terrible disease. In light of that, we have a business model of the university that use where we have to adapt the services we have need to

match the services with the experience's students need. That's the whole purpose of backfilling the funding needed for fall term and the offer to do that for winter term.

- Nick: Thank you for subsidizing the million dollars, as you said it was necessary to put on all the programs that students rely on. I would like to remind you that you leveraged that million dollars in exchange for us not taking WOU to the HECC so when you said this is in good faith so that the university can have things that students need, I don't quite believe if that were true, you would have given us the million dollars even if we did end up going to court because you understand that the importance of that comes above all else. So that's a bit strange to me. There's a lot on my mind with this, as we've been engaged in this process for months, this is the first time we have had a chance to talk. In an email you sent to NJ regarding what your plan was for winter term. This was during the negotiations for charging an online fee, an incidental fee for online students going into fall. We agreed that we would take your million dollars on the condition that you plan to organize the 2020-2021 IFC at the earliest possible date in order to advance incidental fees for winter and spring terms of 2020-2021. This work will form the bases for a joint presentation to the Board of Trustees at the November 18, 2020 meeting. This was written in an email to NJ as part of this deal. When you read it, you can tell very clearly that at one point your plan was to institute an incidental fee for students going into winter and spring term. That is changing it mid-stream in organizing the incidental fees for winter and spring term 2020-2021. So, it seems to him like President Fuller is taking a step back from that plan when in reality that was part of our deal going into winter term. We would really appreciate your help with this in charging an incidental fee to online students as you promised you would.
- President Fuller responded by saying he needs a written proposal for why you want that incidental fee for winter and spring terms. He has said he has concerns with doing this mid academic year because they have

announced fees to students and families for months now. And to now change that, there must be a clear and compelling reason. If by this reason it is because of the funding you would have otherwise collected, if things had been normal, that I still stand by my position in providing you with funding is the key issue there. We have provided a way to do that so the services can continue to be provided. There has been quite a bit of back and forth here. I have still yet failed to see a clear proposal in writing of what it is you are proposing for winter term.

- Makana: Wanting to bring some clarity to this so we don't go on and on with this down this really muddy path. In the statute ORS 352 105, there are four reasons why the Board of Trustees can say no to an incidental fee proposal. One of those is not what you are saying right now, just because you don't agree with it, doesn't mean that we don't have the opportunity to be able to do that. Two, we are trying to have finish our process and we are not getting clear communication with you or your administration on a timeline and we are not able to find out how to do that with your time line. We are not getting that communication, NJ is getting that communication. We are trying to finish our process so that we can get you a proposal to bring to the Board of Trustees. We are being told right off the bat that this is not something that we can do. Then we are being told that we have a different deadline we have to follow and that there are rules we have to follow and we are being communicated to. So, I completely understand about how you are saying about the online tech fees being subsidized for fall. And with the confusion that came over the summer, that was our attempt to make things work for the fall because we knew that a decision had been made that we needed to be sure that our fees and our students' services needs stayed alive. And so that is what we did to make sure that this happened. You (President Fuller) made multiple promises to us as a committee that you would work with us over this term to charge a fee for winter. And now that's being taken back. And now we're being told we didn't provide a proposal. We're working on it. We just

finished our open hearings. We are really trying to do everything we can to be sure that we are not only getting student feedback because as you are correct in your statement that in changing up the fees mid-year can be really scary for a student to see another fee that they didn't have last term and now they do have. We've had an overwhelming amount of support from almost 200 people have said that they want a fee for everyone for this term. So, I think in our efforts as in IFC to follow our own bylaws and process and to try and get you that information, we are doing it in a way to include students so that they will know that in the end. Our frustration comes from that we were told that we could charge that and now we're being told that this isn't the smart decision and that you don't agree with that. I just want to remind us all that this is not your (President Fuller's) solely your decision. And we would be able to make the presentation to the Board of Trustees 100 percent with all the evidence and all the student support and feedback that we have and the feedback we can bring. We are being told that we don't even have that opportunity. Is there something you want to say about that before we continue on, and talk about what Nick said? I think that where we were going was just a bit off the path from where we should be.

- President Fuller responded by saying what he hears Makana saying is that he is stopping you from going to the Board of Trustees. He doesn't see it that way. I don't have anything to stop or to have anything in writing to do that. The language around the fall work that we did. First of all, the proposal sent to HECC was sent to us for the first time from HECC. We never had a conversation about those concerns until that appeal was filed with them. You're right, I did negotiate with NJ and that was it was an opportunity to provide a funding path to allow time in the fall term to organize the IFC that is now organized. We identified our student representatives in advance of the student body. We did everything that we could to accelerate the IFC that is sitting here today. I would say that if there were timing questions from you, that the IFC is a part of ASWOU

from where I sit and the shared governance responsibility I have, deals with shared governance from the point of view is from staff senate and faculty senate and then the student body through ASWOU. So, it is appropriate for me to have conversations with the student body president. It's also appropriate for you to request to be involved with more specific conversations if we need to have more guidance. This is the first time we are having this sort of very candid conversation today. I think there is room for us to identify a path forward. I also think one can look at the opportunity for setting fees for next year, which is the real purpose of this IFC. Just like the last years IFC set the fees and recommendations for the current year. The IFC's primary work is always done a year in advance of implementation with the recommendation that are made. That's where I stand and why I have said as a general rule of changing fees mid-year, especially if the real reason is to provide a funding source that we are now unable to collect due to COVID. I think there are other straight forward solutions to that problem.

- Quentin, first he wanted to follow up, you said that you need a clear and compelling reason for us to charge an incidental fee. You have two. First, you have the student body who overwhelming wants us to charge and incidental fee to all students to fund all areas and keep jobs. Which is something that you don't seem committed to doing. The second compelling reason is that you have a legal obligation to allow us to complete this process. As we see it, you're not doing that. We feel that we have standing to appeal to HECC right now. We plan on doing that unless you start cooperating with us. You also said that you haven't seen anything in writing, you will if you urge the BOT to call an emergency meeting next month. Then you can see something in writing and see a proposal from us to charge an incidental fee from us in winter term. Specifically, my question is, we've had a lot of discussion about the online course fee. We, as a committee feel that it is direct threat to the Incidental Fee Committee and as well as to the general student body. I have asked

David McDonald specifically this two-part question before and have not received a response. So, maybe you could enlighten committee members on this. The first part is, what is the revenue from the online course fee used for? We haven't seen any of those numbers or where that money is going. And secondly, exactly how much has been raised from the online course fee during fall 2020.

- President Fuller responded saying the Board of Trustees last week approved a revised budget for the university. In that there are estimates of what will be raised through the online fee for this coming year assuming that the instruction will continue as it is with 95% or more being online.
- Quentin asks again, exactly how much has been raised in fall 2020?
- President Fuller responded letting him know that he does not have that answer. He would have to look it up and he would have to have Ana on that call and she is not on this call. I can tell you that the budget itself is a budget. There are two things I need to clarify, a budget and what we actually realize. They don't always align one for one. The amount that was in the budget for this year as a result of the shift that we've experienced increased the tech fee, I believe to over 5 million dollars was anticipated over the course of the year. Of that, we've already talked about that we have already allocated one million for fall. There is a proposal in play for what is winter term. The budget was built to move forward with that, so that would be another million dollars. That is in contrast to what would have been collected in an IFC process. I believe last you had a budget of about 4.9 million dollars in IFC fees. I think that's where I'm talking about the idea for providing funding necessary to provide the level of services that the university is actually experiencing with the changes COVID has caused.
- Makana asked if that answered Quentin's question?
- Quentin responded by saying that it did not answer his question and that he would like Dave to take a stab at it and reserves the right to ask a follow up question.

- President Fuller said that he can have the Vice President send what he has collected to Quentin. If your question is how much we have collected up to this date, that's something we can get. He just doesn't have it at his fingertips.
- Quentin replied that he would like to know exactly how much has been collected and exactly where that money is being spent. Dollar per dollar.
- David McDonald has been speaking with Ana about this. They have collected approximately 2.1 million for fall term. In terms of use, that money has been part of our general fund. It has been used to do a number of things including one million that President Fuller noted for IFC backfill. That's half of it right there for fall term. Additional costs were software and instructional designers that we've used to lift up our online production of courses that we've used. It goes into the general fund so it's not like we say, here's 10 dollars and here is where it is spent, every cent of it. We don't budget in that manner. It's budgeted into the general fund so it's used for general campus obligations and general campus operations. 2.1 million was collected fall term. And certainly the 1 million that President Fuller has indicated and has been set aside for IFC. The remaining dollars were distributed was set aside for funds and activities such as instruction designers and software we have to support for online expenses we have.
- Quentin comments that this is his first year of serving on this IFC committee but he has been told by past members from previous years that there has always been a very open and cooperative relationship between the committee and the administration. It does not seem that way this year, and I think even your tone with the committee today and the way you've been answering our questions indicates as much. So, from our perspective, and this might not be true from your perspective, it is our opinion from our perspective, that you are kind of hostile to the idea of us charging an incidental fee this term. And in future terms in this academic year, and we would like to know aside from that you don't want to

change the fee structure mid-stream. Why exactly is it that you are opposed to the incidental fee if that is the same amount of money that is being raised by the online course fee? Why are you opposed to this committee fulfilling our obligations on this?

- President Fuller said that he was not opposed to the incidental fee and charging the incidental fee. Historically we have not charged online students the incidental fee. If students were taking courses face to face, we would apply the fee recommended by last years committee. Which I believe had a flat rate for students taking less than 6 credits and a higher rate for students taking more than 6 hours. The big difference is the mode of instruction and the way we are delivering the courses and the way in which we are collecting the fees. It has shifted, which I have said very clearly that we are collecting more in the tech fee that we would have anticipated had we opened normally in the fall which was everyone's hope when we started doing our planning last spring. Our new reality is that, as you know is that we are online and as a result we are collecting that David talked about which I hope answered your question, by the way. And secondly, we've made the decision to redirect that funding to preserve and replace the funding we would have collected if it had been a normal year. So, if you think I'm against incidental fees, I would say that's a mis-read. During my time here at the university, the administrator advisors have worked cooperatively with IFC and that's true. Other than this meeting, I've attended one other IFC meeting directly. I typically delegate that to the team that meets with you routinely on a regular basis. The extent of your hearing frustration, the frustration I have around is the fact that we don't have a proposal. You say if I call a BOT into a special session that then I will see a proposal. That seems backwards to me. First of all, I don't call the BOT into a special meeting.
- Quentin commented that this is not what he said.
- President Fuller said, that you had told him that you would know what the proposal was when there was a special session of the Board.

- Quentin, Yes, if you urged the board to honor our request and call a special meeting, which they are allowed to do per their bylaws. We feel disrespected by Chair Comp by not giving us any reason.
- President Fuller said that before he could urge that he would have to know the urgency of the request and the proposal itself.
- Makana said that they had sent a formal request in an email from herself, as the IFC Chair to Chair Comp with the reasoning behind wanting the special session of the Board of Trustees. I don't want us to bicker and move on for now. Unfortunately, her Wi-Fi went out so please put in the chat, "Stack" to talk again.
- Nick Denning commented that one of his concerns is that even if you give us money, going into next year, let's say the vaccine comes out and students are back on campus and taking in-person classes again and we were able to charge an incidental fee. One of the reasons you and the board can deny our fee proposal is if we request 5% over what the money we have taken in through the incidental fee in a previous year. For instance, this year we aren't taking any money in, well, we are taking in a little bit. We are barely taking any money in revenue wise from the incidental fee that is only be charged to in-person students. So, we are worried that next year, the administration will have the power to deny almost any fee that we propose. Which would make us reliant on the online course fee based on the money you are willing to give us from it. That would give you and the BOT a lot of power that we don't feel really comfortable with, and Oregon law doesn't feel comfortable with giving, so that is our concern with charging an incidental fee, at least that is one of them. We need to have at least a certain amount of revenue so that we are not blocked by the administration next year, or at least potentially blocked.
- President Fuller said he was reading from his presentation made to the BOT about ORS 352 and to your point, Item 2A sub C that the total mandatory incidental fees budget is an increase more than 5% over the

previous year. The key word there is budget. So, we need to differentiate between what is budgeted and what is collected.

- Makana noted that they were told last year that it was 5% above the revenue collected and that was what they were told in the previous year's IFC as Juliana and Nick and herself can vouch for as they were part of the process last year.
- President Fuller said he would be happy to refer that to his general council to interpret that language but it was his general understanding that it was the budget.
- Nick said that if that is true than that is really good news and makes him really happy.
- Kayley made a quick comment that people are talking about how things were and how things are. She just wanted to remind everyone that we are in a pandemic and we've never seen things like this before. We've never had a campus that has been fully online before. So, any reference to this is how it's always been and we've never charged online students before and that this isn't really relevant to this conversation because all of the students are online. Overwhelming students are still wanting to see services offered. You had said there is only about 60% of student capacity on campus. Even if there are usually 1,100 students on campus. Western has 5,000 student which means that we are primarily a commuter campus. This means that primarily students live in surrounding areas. She doesn't know about her peers but I didn't pick up my apartment and leave just because we went online. I still live in the surrounding areas, as do a large majority of students that I know of still live in those surrounding areas. So, we still need those services that are offered and paid for by the IFC fee. I understand that you are only seeing 60% of capacity on campus in the residence halls but you don't have any data on students in the surrounding areas. We are primarily a commuter campus anyway, so the majority of people who were using services in the first place were never going to be living on campus. I just want to remind us that we have a large amount of

commuter students on our campus. We shouldn't be referring to how things were because we are online and it doesn't really have any precedence as to whether we are in person or not. That's why we are having this issue in the first place is because things need to change. The world has changed and we need to adapt with it.

- Quentin noted that we've talked a lot about the actual fee structure and the amount of the fee. I wanted to talk specifically about some of the lives that have been destroyed because of being laid off. We have had multiple discussions over the summer and have had allocations more than what was requested to different area heads contingent upon the promise that they would either 1) protect certain amounts of FTE or 2) or raise those up to 1.0 FTE. We were not informed when area heads continued to lay people off this term. When we questioned area heads they said they were on our side and supported not laying people off and they cared about their people and protect them but your presidential cabinet stepped in and told them there was not a need for those positions. I was wondering if you could enlighten us as to why you think you have a better grasp on student need and departmental need than area heads, departments and students do.
- President Fuller responded by saying that staffing comes to him from his cabinet. They come from conversations that the Vice President and their reports. Many of those conversations were held in Student Affairs. Those were all predicated on the fact that our world has changed and we would all like to be at a place where we have no layoffs. Regrettably we are in a situation where we have been affected by the fact that we've had to deal with COVID and had to adjust by all the ways you've all described. That leads us to the point of view that we have to provide and pay for the level of services we need. To match services delivered. Our preferences are to not have any effects on our employees, I share that. The reality is that we have impacts on employees because of this changed business model. Some are straight forward, some have been in student housing and

dining. We have fewer students on campus taking advantage of those services and that has affected campus dining and this effects the volume of work to be done. We had effects on our classrooms in the fall that were impacted by the fact that we didn't have face to face classes which changed the frequency of custodial help needed as well. These are all part of the fiscal side of the university's business model that I am essentially responsible for in and to make these decisions. The IFC budget provides a plan that then drives services and in a normal year we would make adjusts to staffing and we have the ability to do so. We've added some positions since I've been here five years. We have had some in support that I have added and that the IFC has identified and we have then provided for. But as services diminish, there is a natural and necessary response to the total FTE that's committed. I would be kidding you and myself if I were to say that that is not going to be a factor as we navigate the remainder of the months of COVID. The good news is that there appears to be a light at the end of the tunnel with a vaccine and immunization with a better promise of returning to a normal situation in the coming 6-8 months.

- Quentin responded by saying a vaccine won't bring back jobs that you have eliminated. Those people you laid off have potentially lost homes and health care protections and potentially lost the ability to provide food and comfortable living for their children. None of that will be brought back by a vaccine and that is on you, President Fuller and your cabinet. So, my question to you is that you made some necessary changes because there wasn't as much money on campus. However, there was enough money! We specifically gave enough to all areas so there wouldn't be a single layoff employee and you over rode that and still laid people off. I don't believe when you say care about protecting jobs because at every step of the way and not just IFC but faculty and staff across campus. We have not seen you prioritize keeping positions.

- President Fullers said first, you don't give money, you pass a budget, and secondly, I worked with the cabinet officers to provide and maintain services in our students that are needed in their quest to obtain their degrees. I don't like having to do layoffs than anyone else, but yet in higher education is buffeted, like many other industries by this terrible disease.
- Makana, jumped in by commenting that this is just going too far. The layoffs at the Student Health and Counseling Center has gone too far, because of the budget and the money. As a student who just tested positive for COVID, the services provided at the Health & Counseling Services were appalling. There was one doctor! There aren't enough doctors and I had to wait 4 hours to get helped because they have so many students they have to help. There is one doctor, one nurse, and one person at the front office. That is putting our lives in jeopardy. I totally understand that the students don't have a lot of say in where staff and faculty go but even in this situation, IFC has no say in any of this. But if you're trying to support students, why was there not a backfill of their accounts? Why did we not help them? What needed to happen so we had doctors during a pandemic? I don't understand that, and that is why I have a very hard time believing you when you say you care about staff and faculty. When the students who are here and paying our tuition, I just wanted to get tested. I needed help, and they tried. They wanted to help but they can't because you fired them all! So, what about that, and the fact there is a student need and an actual need in a global pandemic. What about that?
- President Fuller said that the staffing in the Health Center has been managed by and provided by the professionals there. One of their funding sources was their reserves. Fewer students have signed up for those services than has been historically been so. He apologized for her being denied services.

- Makana wanted to make it clear that she was not denied services. She was put in a line because they didn't have enough people to help and to be able to help everyone who needed help or feel sick and trying to keep themselves safe and their roommates. That 60% could go down drastically because they have to test so many people. I was not denied services and I was able to go get tested. The fact that I had to wait and fear because they didn't have enough people, they are trying and doing their best and trying to help me was frightening and scary from a human perspective.
- President Fuller went on to say that this was the first he was hearing of this. He is glad that you were not denied services. He will look into this with Dr. Dukes as soon as we are off this call.
- Quentin commented that he has also laid off counselors that students are relying on right now.
- President Fuller asked specifically what area, what unit and where.
- Quentin responded by letting him know it was in the Student Health and Counseling Center.
- President Fuller said he find out what the staffing is in the Student Health and Counseling Center is and would look into this.
- Makana commented that they used to have a sane room for victims of sexual assault on campus so they had a safe place to go if they needed to get the services to needed and required as victims of sexual assault and now it's gone too. They were told they no longer had funding for this.
- President asked for Abbey's House to give him a location for that please.
- Nick commented that was through Student Health and Counseling.
- Makana said that Abbey's House was one of the places that worked with them. A staff person had gone with them, but they no longer have a staff person at this point. There were so many things cut people cut and programs cut that at this point and areas that don't have funding that at this point. I can see that you are seeing some of the things that we are feeling. Honestly, I'm sorry that it is coming out like this but when students

are feeling in struggles and lost, scared and sick, and they don't even have those services. That's frightening and that doesn't make me want to come to WOU as a student, not as an IFC member. This is not an IFC issue. I am glad to see that you seem to care a little bit and I'm hoping that something good can come from this. I'm sorry to have brought this up and I'm sorry to IFC for brining this up but I just needed to get this out and say this. We are running out of time.

- President would like to continue this conversation about some of the other frustrations you have had. Please contact NJ or Makana and let them know the frustrations you have. If you let me know with some advanced notice, if you have a meeting later on in this term, I can get it on my calendar with some advance notice and we can do another Zoom meeting. He had another meeting he had to get to. My take away more urgently is that I find out more about and I will look into the Health and Counseling Center. I also want to tell you that this process is one that I support setting the fees for next year and that the IFC process does work and that I want to thank you for the work you have done. I look forward to seeing the recommendations for next year in particularly and any proposals you have and that you want the board to consider. I stand ready to be scheduled for another meeting if that is necessary.
- Quentin asked if the meeting today had been scheduled and President Fuller had been available from 11:00 to 1:00 to meet with us today? That was what the schedule was that you had agreed to.
- President Fuller said that originally that Makana and he had scheduled the meeting but hadn't heard from anyone. Things in his life happened and he didn't hear back until later in the weekend when things had already been scheduled. He has a state senator and a board member that he blocked that time for that he needs to prep for that he had originally scheduled for. That was last Wednesday or Thursday and got the call late in the weekend about the 11:00 start. He apologized for not being able to be at our disposal.

- Makana wanted it on record that she was diagnosed Friday and had symptoms since Monday and that was very difficult for her and she just couldn't get to things.
- President Fuller said he is not blaming anyone or doing this on purpose. He just is saying that he has a job to do and he has to make adjustments once he has other commitments and pressures. He said that he believes that he has made it clear to us that he knows what he needs to do next.
- Juliana would like to make a recommendation that it would be very appreciated as a committee if they could communicate through our Chair in relaying information when it has to do with our budgets and what we are working with.
- Makana commented that if the offer made to the ASWOU president, if it would have come to her, they could have looked it over much quicker. And they could have come to a consensus on it if it would have been sent directly to Makana. She asked if President Fuller could communicate directly with her on IFC matters from here on out?
- President Fuller said that he doesn't defer with the president on how he wants to handle committees and subgroups of the ASWOU organization. I will talk to NJ about his preferred solution on this is and follow that advice.
- Quentin commented that NJ in previous meetings has said that he would prefer that President Fuller communicate directly with IFC on IFC matters. We have that in a recorded meeting.
- Makana commented that NJ is at this meeting and here to speak to this matter.
- NJ said that he wants to have the IFC chair get a response if they ask a question.
- Makana asked if President could please communicate directly with her on IFC matters.
- President Fuller responded by saying yes, going forward he would communicate directly with him. He also requested that we know that when his advisors give you answers in meetings that answers that have

been vetted through my advisor process. So, they are speaking on my behalf so he would respectfully ask that when you are asking questions and you get answers, that those answers should be taken as if they are coming from him. That's why those advisors are on your committee.

- Makana said that yes, we can do that. She thanked President Fuller.
- President then left the call.

Meeting was ended due to losing quorum.

- Quentin wanted to mention the disappointment with the lack of answers to direct questions and that this president has been set over this term.
- Makana expressed her appreciation for everyone coming on such short notice.

4. Messages from the floor – there were none.

5. Adjournment

- i. Meetings was adjourned by Makana at 12:06 PM