

STUDENT FEE REVIEW BOARD

Minutes

Saturday, October 24, 2020

9:00 AM

<https://unm.zoom.us/j/94165374331>

I. Opening

- a. Call to order
Call to Order at 9:04
- b. Roll call
Ahmadian – y, Hill – Y, Hotz – Y, Reddy – Y, Romero – Y, Sylla – Y, Amin – Y
- c. Approval of Minutes
- d. Motion to approve and seconded passed unanimously by voice vote
- e. Approval of Agenda
Moved and passed unanimously by voice vote

II. Preliminary Business

- a. Opening Remarks
- b. Mia – If you are directly affiliated with departments you can abstain from certain processes. Norma and Rosenda are here to present how much funding we have
- c. Public Comment
Hi, I'm Norma Allen from the budget office and we're going to walk you through fiscal year 22 projections. This is the projections for fiscal year ending which will end June 30th of 21. TO the far left there are a few categories for different student fees. Mandatory Student Fees which is the pot you all will be working with. The ASUNM fee which is the student fees that are allocated to ASUNM the first budget that was approved in March was approved with a 4.5 credit hour drop. The total budget for the Spring was 32.7 million dollars. As you know with the special session this summer, and COVID. In June, enrollment was looking very grim. All the uncertainty, with are we going to open, are we going to be online there was so many unknowns. The Regents allowed us to revise the budget allowed us to reduce it to a 10-credit hour drop. The total approved was 30.2 million dollars. That's how we started the year in July. Enrollment is better than we projected. We projected a 10 SCH drop and it is more like a 4.5 SCH drop like we predicted in the spring. Summer is done and Fall is about done with the money coming in. We have Spring and we are

having to come up with a forecast with what Spring of 21 will look like. Usually it is 89% of what the Fall semester revenue is. We could usually go with about a 90% of fall. The student fees in total would come in at 34 million dollars. That is an overall surplus of 4.1 million dollars. The budget that was revised in July and to a normal year we are looking at a surplus. However, we aren't in a normal year. We went to enrollment management and asked that we usually budget 90% of the year. They said that it would be safe to do 88%. In column H, this is what you are looking to allocate. Right now, our recommendation is Column H, Row 5. 32,646,433 and this is what we recommend that you balance to in deliberations.

Mia – Can you clarify that the 3.3 million that is surplus is something that ends up in the SFRB reserves.

Norma - Yes, remember that some of that goes to ASUNM and GPSA. Really what you have for the activity fee is 3.1 million.

Norma – This year has in all of the units that request funding from SFRB, the middle column is the request that they put in. Rosenda is going to walk you through this. In the second tab is each unit and other sources of funding, and their reserves.

Rosenda – These are all the department names that have requested SFRB funding. We wanted to show that now for FY21 requests we are able to show the difference between their budgets and what they are asking for. The total student activity fee line the totals . Down at the bottom is one-time funding and at the bottom we have a snapshot of the reserves. At the bottom of the sheet we

Victoria – Can you speak about the portion going to debt services and the portion we have to allocate?

Rosenda – We have to pay these they are already committed. We went ahead and what you have to work with is 32.5 million dollars. You then have the debt services that are about 19.1 million. That has to be funded. If you look at the bottom of the sheet, we have it here where it is balanced for you. Right now

Victoria – we have 32.6 million to work with and 13 million in requests, and we have the

Norma - We are really lucky to be in this position,

Mia- Can you talk about the 293 thousand number.

Norma - This is a 1 percent number and is taking our current projection and be conservative. If we were to raise or lower fees by one percent that how much money it would generate or decrease. If we increase with the old raise and how much it would cost with 12 and 15 hours. We do have a section for graduate and undergrad students since they are different rates.

Rosenda – In the sheet you can see what they are requesting along with their

I&G funding. There is other budgeted support. In this column is the Reserve and if you look over to the right, we can show you the whole department reserves.

Mia – If you do have questions Norma and Rosenda will be here for the rest of the day and they are very intelligent. This shows that we can fund all departments as is and have reserve.

Tim Gutierrez – We are in a good position compared to where we thought we would be. You would be able to fund a lot of these units at the level they requested. Many of these units didn't ask for more money. They were holding the line when making requests. Your support that you show them would send a huge message. It is my thought; you know there are a lot of passionate people out there. I think it's a great thing they aren't going to have to be cut. I'm not usually a touchy-feely guy, I know working with them this past semester this would send a fantastic message that you could send to them.

III. Business

A. Deliberations

1. Motion to move outside of parli pro Passed Unanimously.
 - a. Mia – How did yall want to do deliberations. We can go alphabetically or go through departments that are asking for too much.
 - b. Emma – I think the latter and then going through every single one at the end.
 - c. Mia – I think if we are talking about budgets, we can talk about three or four at once to be more efficient. I think we can look at ASPIRE first.
2. **ASPIRE**
 - a. Nikhil – I think if we can wait til the end since if we have enough, we can fund at the end.
 - b. Victoria – I think some were a bit extreme with the request.
 - c. Mia – I would not advocate for funding this department the next board may feel obligated to fund them because of our funding.
3. **APACC**
 - a. Victoria – Personally I think it should be created and it should be similar to the creation of the LGBTQ Resource Center. I think their request right now is a little extreme.
 - b. Rico – I agree with that the initial request is kind of steep. I think that we should give enough to get them past their initial stage. I think this would be a great place to start and make some changes.
 - c. Sall – I agree with both Victoria and Rico do you have a ballpark?
 - d. Victoria – I think that we should give them a staff member and cut the GA position. I think honestly full fund staff, and the \$9000 for office and that's it.
 - e. Mia – The 18000 for fringe benefits was that for the GA Position or the staff.
 - f. Tim – I was under the assumption that it would be for staff.
 - g. Sall – Are you saying 57000? Where did you get the 9000 for

the office?

- h. Victoria – Yes, and that is what LGBTQ did whenever they started?
- i. Nikhil – I want to say that we could possibly support them more, it was 2010 when they started, and costs have changed. If we are in a place to support.
- j. Rico – I'm not sure if the model that the LGBTQ resource center is the one that they are trying to adopt. As Nihil already said, I think that \$9000 is more than enough. Some of the stuff in the space is going to be given to them. In my opinion they are already a group they just don't have a space on campus. They are just trying to get there.
- k. Sall – This first year they aren't going to have as much traffic.
- l. Victoria – Do you think it would be better to look line item by line item to see what to cut.
- m. Sall – If they already have a space what's the 9000 for.
- n. Emma – I don't want to be unfair, so I'll remain straight forward. CEOP is on board and it shouldn't take away from their operating costs, but in general if we were to print it shouldn't take away from their budget, since we are supposed to be a department under them. If we were to get funding, we still have to follow the student affairs model in becoming a center, and we haven't received that many updates still. We do have a space technically, but that's why the presenters outlined the general priorities, so that we aren't taking away from another department. We don't want to take away from a department.
- o. Tim G – CEOP is an incubator since getting space on campus is extremely difficult. When sharing services, it becomes a lot. The idea is to help get their feet underneath them, but we don't want CEOP to completely support them but to help them get on their feet.
- p. Sall – Any money besides staff would go toward operating not space?
- q. Emma – Yes
- r. Mia – Counting everything else I would be comfortable giving them 10000 for operating one staff and have discussion on a student position.
- s. Victoria – Personally I agree with that.
- t. Sall – What are we looking at for student jobs?
- u. Mia – They asked for four student jobs, but since they are new, I think it could be beneficial to have student jobs. I think four is a little much maybe 2 if I could get discussion.
- v. Sall – Do you know what LGBTQ is?
- w. Victoria – I don't know but I think two would be okay
- x. Tim – They have two now.
- y. Nikhil – As of now we are positive with one staff position, and we are looking to fund student positions.
- z. Mia – Looking at the LGBTQ resource center is only asking for \$10000 for student employees so I wouldn't feel comfortable with funding more than that.
- aa. Rico – I don't believe that we know exactly how they want to operate, and they might not want to fit in to the LGBTQ path in starting this.
- bb. Emma – I will try to remain diplomatic as possible and I

won't be voting on this. I would definitely say that it's the most fair to resemble on other resource centers and how they started. I would like to move forward and agree with what you all are doing. I think it's important to see how the other centers started, and making this budget is the total operating costs if we were fully functioning. I think letting the next board to determine how the center has grown and if the deserve more.

- cc. Rico – I think that 10000 is a fair number, and with that is 2 employees.
- dd. Emma – I think we have it ready, I'm not sure that we should give any more money than what the LGBTQ resource center gets.
- ee. Nikhil – I disagree with that since it was a different situation. I think that we should reflect what they did in the past.
- ff. Sall –
- gg. Rico – We have to model it after something, I understand why you're saying that we have enough. I feel like we are doing our job in supporting them and I believe that we are doing the right thing right now.
- hh. Mia – The Women's Resource Center I believe is the smallest request, and that may help make decision for a cap.
- ii. Emma – Eventually the plan would to not fund the staff position from student fees, since we aren't able to request funding from the state.
- jj. Nihil – For the sake of discussion, I think we have an idea and we can come back to it.
- kk. Mia – Victoria – I think we can move on since we have an idea

4. Student Publications

- a. Sall – This is only one of the two budget requests that I am going to take a stand on . I think that while allocating these funds they should be used appropriately. Based on the research I have done on the Daily Lobo, I have not so far this year that was poorly managed. Based on their request. The experience wouldn't change if you were writing online and between printing. They also weren't looking to change the way they operate and the only thing that. They have 13 photographers on staff. The student fee board member at NMSU and the way they operate FY2015 they mandated that RoundUP move online and they had to cut staff by 30%. There isn't one year that they haven't been in the deficit. I think they have time to revamp their website.
- b. Emma – I just want to say I respectfully disagree. I don't think it's the job of the board to change the structure of a department. If we were to look at a department and look at a resource center it is very disrespectful. The Daily Lobo isn't the only thing in student publication, however most of their revenue is through print ads. I know they could do more ads with other online publications that are competing with them. They have shown how they have adjusted their budgets and as a result from the student government fee decreasing, they have been decreasing as well. They were responding to what they thought was going to be a forced change, and if it was another support center then they would have to change as a result of that, but we shouldn't dictate how they change.

- c. Mia – They are requesting 85000 in student employee salaries since that isn't the money, they are requesting from us.
- d. Rico – SO we can clarify everything, as a Senator I have worked with the Daily Lobo and the thing that I keep hearing. We get more money from printing ads it is true. IF moving online overtime then that's the long goal. I think that is the correct approach. When a person is suggesting, I think that it is completely fair that this needs to stop and it is okay. We just spend 30 min to dictate how they should operate. If we were to pull up statistics and look how many students use this resource. We shouldn't put money in to a blackhole. If we look at
- e. Nihil – As a member of the board, I think it's Sall's right to as those type of questions. It shouldn't have been that hard. Regarding funding we need to look into what they are trying to do. We are discussing here forever.
- f. Victoria – As much as I think the Daily Lobo should reevaluate, their printing services isn't what they are requesting from us. Technically we should only be talking about their student salaries.
- g. Raby – When we went and visited them some students weren't on their payroll and were payed by the piece. I don't know that all of them are continued to be payed.
- h. Mia – If we went by the APACC, they asked for \$10000 for two employees. What amount would y'all be comfortable with.
- i. Tim – We are in the process of doing a full evaluation and with the sense of overspending. We are trying to balance between the virtual and printed copy. Right now, they aren't printing as much so they aren't generating as much revenue. We will continue to work to help balance the budget. With the student employees being funded it would help offset the pro staff being cut.
- j. Nikhil – They are requesting 85000, but I think it's best to discuss that section.
- k. Mia - In FY19 they spent 85000 on student salaries and that's what they requested this year. As an org that's funded by student fees it is in our jurisdiction to how they operate. We are in a year where we can fund everything at 100%.
- l. Emma – I agree that we have the jurisdiction to discuss what we are funding, like with APACC we are funding them in full. Since it's student salaries and I think we should fund this in full. They need to look in other ways to cut their deficit.
- m. Sall – I think that we at least have an obligation to have oversight when there is mismanagement. They should be able to anticipate and adapt to adjust to changes. If we fund them fully, I don't see any change I think their deficit would just increase.
- n. Rico – I am conflicted on this because student salaries are very important to me and I want anyone that's a part of my school it gets what they need. The only reason, I feel like we hear this talk every time we talk about them. I don't see why we would give them 85000, if we cut them, they would have to give

- o. Mia – Their detrital staff is salary and their graphic editor is on salary and the rest is on salary.
- p. Sall – Would it be in our jurisdiction, if we adjust based and could there be a cap on how much they could do.
- q. Tim – You guys obviously control the funds they get from you; with their revenue they can do what they want to do. They recently moved under me, but you are right there is a deficit issue and part of the idea of getting funding is to stabilize them. Here is what you can spend, I can't argue with you it is always an ongoing struggle, but all I can say to you is that we are in the process of reducing and living within our means. If we continue on the track, we will not have a Lobo anymore.
- r. Sall – Did you have any influence on the number they asked for. Was this a number you formulated with them?
- s. Tim- Yes, you guys right now have been around 80 in a deficit, you need to be looking to stop the bleed and start taking reductions to reduce the deficit.
- t. Sall – If we infuse the money that hopefully that will stop it, but I don't have any issue considering this, but I think we have an obligation to mandate or some oversight and ask how they are going to reduce their deficit.
- u. Nikhil – This is something that we could ask, on our application.
- v. Mia – Technically we can make recommendations to departments, and since this goes into their index, there isn't oversight what's in there. This was before Tim's time too. I do have faith that
- w. Sall – What's the position of mandating that some of these positions get moved into stipend rolls. Can we cap the number of articles?
- x. Tim – I'm not sure that we can do that.
- y. Rico – If we are being financially wise, we wouldn't fund them in full. If we want to do a service to them, we would fund them in full. I don't think that you should
- z. Tim – Student Fees will never be used for debt services. We already have a plan where student affairs are paying into the debt. I will do everything to make sure that they are following the rules.
- aa. Rico – This is reassuring to me, but this is something where it is a real committee where we can tackle what is happening.
- bb. Victoria – Throughout out my experience, I have interacted with a lot of DL reporters and they are severely underpaid. They get between 15-20 dollars per article, limiting that they would have to find other revenue for their actual income. That would be \$100 per semester, so good luck getting food. Most of them this is their job and they are all in. They are also trying to pump out revenue to make sure things are fresh and that's how they get traffic. I think it's irresponsible to touch student employees and lowering to last year's budget is extreme. From my interactions, I don't believe they are abusing the system. I think it should be 70,000 and nothing less.
- cc. Kyla – I think that we should look at numbers, and I think the math would be about 45000 and divide that by 20 to find the number of articles being written.

- dd. Emma – It depends on whether it's a part time thing, but it depends on the Journalist. There are some that have repeated articles, but there are a lot of people that this is their only job.
- ee. Kyla – I think the overall reports that are written in a year. What is the cap on articles and am curious what the numbers on?
- ff. Greg – We need to start setting a number and working toward that. My opinion is that Student Publications needs to fix things, but we do have the luxury of giving them more money to help them progress toward that. We have upper admin that thinks the exact same thing. Anything that we do today isn't going to immediately fund it. I think it's fair where we are giving more money, but also being fiscally responsible.
- gg. Raby – I think from what they said they have a meeting with suggestion on articles to have. You're right if students want to write more they have to option. In my opinion we shouldn't fund them in full but not destabilize them.
- hh. Mia – We are trying to find a number that makes sense, but I think we are going to find an estimate.
- ii. Rico – Me personally 45000 to 60000 is maximum I think that is generous to me.
- jj. Sall – I'm not going They need to have a deficit reduction plan and there needs to be some accountability.
- kk. Norma – That department does have a budget reduction plan on file with the budget office.
- ll. Sall – I'm leaning closer to Rico's number and it's not the responsibility of the students.
- mm. Victoria – you can make recommendations to next year's board.
- nn. Nikhil – How about we fund the \$65000, so that the stipend positions are not being affected by this.
- oo. Sall – Is it within our jurisdiction to tell them to reduce their workforce.
- pp. Tim – You can say yes this is what we want. But since it's done by article it has to be driven by the dollar amount. I think saying that if you don't spend within you limits you can threaten not to fund them next year. I'm trying to be direct.
- qq. Sall – If we were to reduce the funding, I think that 13 photographers are too much.
- rr. Tim – It is my responsibility to ensure that they spend within their means. In doing that I try to do that without crippling the Lobo. No matter what their budget is. We have talked about the whole structure, maybe where it is even fully student run. My commitment is to try to get them to operate within their budget.
- ss. Sall – If we mandate that they are following a deficit reduction plan that would be my plan.
- tt. Emma – In the past they got funded at like 13000 and obviously they didn't cut student jobs after that. Was that money coming from their revenue?
- uu. Mia - That is where the deficit gets to.
- vv. Emma – I don't see how cutting funding to student jobs is going to help them with their deficit. I think that is what this conversation has been about. I don't see how cutting this line item when we have the ability to fund it is going to help them

because cutting it isn't going to help them with that deficit. I don't think I have the knowledge on how to help reduce that and cutting isn't going to help that.

- ww. Rico – When you are looking at a grand scheme of their operations and if they are going to overspend. Second, so we can get into numbers that Kyla gave us a great model of 45000 which leaves room that gives us 4000 articles a year. I think if people want to raise it but, 60000 is the max and it should be the most that we give. Any type of number we do have
- xx. Mia – The 45000 is the 2000 articles and with that metric and that's where we're at
- yy. Nikhil – There is a section in the application on how you have taken SFRB funding. I think that maybe we can type the number we are talking about.
- zz. Victoria – I know we aren't in parli pro where we do round robin where everyone goes around and says their opinion. Everyone should just say a number. I personally would
- aaa. Nikhil – 60000
- bbb. Rico – 45000
- ccc. Sall – 45000 with a mandate they follow a deficit plan
- ddd. Emma – 65000
- eee. Kyla – 65000 we should still consider the full amount and the money is going toward students and I think that we can agree that they need it 85000 is something we should consider.
- fff. Greg – 65000
- ggg. Raby – I agree with what Kyla said I am at 65 to 85000 and there is oversight
- hhh. Mia – I would feel comfortable with 55 to 65

5. Motion to move back in to parli pro

6. Student Publications

- a. Motion to move into student publications, passed unanimously by voice vote
- b. Nikhil – Move to cut line item 4 from 85000 to 65000
Seconded by Emma Hotz
- Sall – I would move that in number 10 that they do have to follow a deficit reduction plan
 - POR: Victoria – It will be a separate motion
 - POR: Emma – we are now discussing the motion
 - Nikhil – I think that it's best if we people can vote for what number they want to in the chat.
 - Emma – You can vote yes and make another motion. It does have to pertain to the motion with discussion. We will get a consensus on whether we support the motion. Ahmadian – y, Hill – Y, Hotz – Y, Reddy – Y, Romero – Y, Sylla – Y, Mia – Y
 - Motion passed; Line item 4 now reads \$65000
- c. Move to table, and seconded, Failed unanimously
- d. Sall – MOTION that we add a recommendation, or mandate that in future applications that they show that they are following UNM's deficit reduction plan, and how they are reducing their operating costs following that
- Seconded
 - Questions:

- Nikhil – Asking that they include how many students are being funded with his money
 - Discussion:
 - Nikhil: FIRENDLY AMENDMENT to show how money is being spent and how many students are using this funding
 - Sall: I accept
 - Victoria: FRIENDLY AMENDMENT to ask specifically how many positions are salary and stipend amount
 - Nikhil – I was under the impression that we were a
 - Passed unanimously by voice vote
- e. Victoria: MOTION to table Student Publications, and seconded passed unanimously by voice vote

7. APACC

- a. Emma: MOTION to open APACC, and seconded , motion passed unanimously
- b. Mia - Entertain MOTION to reduce line item 17 to \$86000, not taken up by the board
- c. Emma – I’m looking at the budget and I believe that line 17 is food. Nevermind.
- d. Rico – When we are doing these reductions, are we going off the forms or the main excel sheet.
- e. Norma – I discourage allocating line item by line item, since you are holding them to use it just for that. Then you start getting into a very difficult way to manage funding. I discourage any type of that. In the past the SFRB may say they don’t want this, but each line item would not be manageable.
- f. Rosenda – Those budget forms are more of a tool to view what they are proposing but that would be able to you to provide a lump sum.
- g. Tim – When you are adjusting their funds, they are going to have to rework the budget internally
- h. Emma – Last year, it really just depended on the department that we were working on. If there is something that we specifically don’t want to fund, but I think we have already discussed the line items we do want to fund. I think that’s what we did last year. That is kind of how we did it, but last year was more specific since we were limited on funds, but since it is easier that could be a possibility.
- i. Mia – I want to clarify was so that we could discuss how to fund out of parli-pro and ten just come in to parli pro to fund.
- j. Rico – I’m not suggesting we go line by line; we should have something that we have line by line. For instance, we were all looking at food. I think we should all look at the same page
- k. Victoria – In the motion can you say what you are looking to fund, maybe.
- l. Mia – Would you like me to make that motion again and outline it.
- m. Mia - Entertain MOTION to reduce line item 17 to \$86000, with 18000 going toward fringe 10000 to student employment, and 10000 to operating not taken up by the board, seconded

- Questions: None
 - Discussion:
 - Victoria: I would like to see the number lower maybe like 70-75000.
 - Nikhil – I think the only place to reduce would be faculty salary, but if we reduce it to a certain level, they would have to cut certain things.
 - Victoria: FRIENDLY AMENDMENT to reduce the line item to 75000 accepted my Mia
 - Rico: I think we should fail this motion so that we can have a number and discuss that.
 - VOICE VOTE failed, with all but one abstention
- n. Nikhil: MOTION to move out of parli pro, seconded Passed Unanimously
- Sall: I think to start us in the ballpark, based on the financial records I propose that we match the Director of the LGBTQ resource center.
 - Greg: I feel like that number isn't not correct, but that position should be payed far more. We should adjust this one to be fair.
 - Sall – I agree with you, but principally since his salary isn't increasing, so we should keep this.
 - Emma – I just wanted to provide extra information, so we specifically called this a program director so that they didn't have to pay the same as other resource centers. To cut this more you could cut a student job.
 - Rico – Maybe I'm off, but everyone that we are comparing to and since APACC is in its starting stages. So, if we are in this metric, we should use LGBTQ Resource Center. I feel like that salary is more than fair.
 - Mia – How would you like to break this down?
 - Victoria – Using Frankie's salary it would be a \$8000 cut from what you have.
 - Mia – How would fringe benefits be calculated?
 - Norma – Whatever the salary is it is about 35%
 - Greg - So it gets us right around 74000. I think everything else is fair with me with the two student positions and the operating.
 - Mia – Is there any further discussion on this, we should just move in to parli pro to vote and limit the discussion there.
 - Greg – If we have the opportunity to pay salaries, they would be much higher, and we have the opportunity to set precedent. I think we have the opportunity to set the precedent and put a salary
 - Rico – I don't believe having a new position getting more than an established position. What we are doing now is fair, but this level is what they are going to increase in the future.
 - Nikhil – I think we should come back after funding and then we should finalize the other two units that we wanted to change.
 - Sall – We should have something on the books for APACC right now any we can come back.

- Mia – Are we all comfortable 72650 for APACC. The other department was ASPIRE and since it is an academic department it should be funded at 0.
 - Nikhil – I’m okay with that. I would like further discussion later.
- o. Entertain a MOTION to move back in to parli pro, passed unanimously by voice vote
 - p. ENTERTAIN a MOTION to reduce line item 17 to 72650, seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote
 - q. ENTERTAIN a MOTION to table APACC made and seconded
 - r. Discussion:
 - s. Nikhil: I feel like we are doing wrong with tabling, I feel like tabling is for when you don’t have enough information. One more thing to bring up, our policy says that each unit is supposed to get a supermajority.
 - t. Mia – We have been following since we have had a supermajority in each vote.
 - u. Rico – Can you explain that again?
 - v. Nikhil – When we looked at each unit application it was simple majority, when we are approving each unit as a whole we are not doing that we are simply tabling it. Our policy clearly says that each unit must get a super majority vote. That gives the right for grad students to have a voice.
 - w. Rico – A super majority vote and up to this point no one has voted no. In a sense when we table it, it’s so we can move back in to it. What you’re saying is if we table it then we are leaving business undone.
Victoria – Just basically tabling something doesn’t mean you can’t go back do to it. I think we should move straight in to ASPIRE.
 - x. Emma: When we are finally done with these motions and finalizing the budget, we can do a roll call vote, and if there is more discourse on a motion, we can see more clear how people are voting. Please wait to be out of turn. Please wait to be called on.
 - y. Passed Unanimously by Voice Vote

8. ASPIRE

- a. Entertain a Motion to open ASPIRE, made and seconded passed unanimously by voice vote
 - b. Nikhil – Motion to reduce line item 22 to \$0, seconded and passed by voice vote with 6-1-0
 - c. Motion to table ASPIRE, seconded and passed unanimously by Voice Vote
9. Motion to Recess until 1:00 PM, seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.
 10. Call this meeting to order at 1:02 PM
 - a. Ahmadian – y, Hill – Y, Hotz – Y, Reddy – Y, Romero – Y, Sylla – Y, Amin – Y
 - b. Victoria - I know that a couple budgets have requested their budget and taken them back, are those included?
 - c. Mia - Yes, it is not on the sheet.
 - d. Rosenda - I know you all voted to decrease ASPIRE to 0, does that include one-time funding?
 - e. Mia - That will be done separately
 - f. Motion to move out of parli pro, seconded and passed

- unanimously by voice vote
- g. Sall: I want to make one thing clear for the board, I have never once mentioned my position working with a US Senator's office. I'm acting in my capacity as a student and find it disgusting and find what I do outside of my role as a student and call it journalism. It is trash, and if anyone has any questions to Senator Heinrich, please reach out to him, but he is not involved in this. Shame on you to anyone who thinks this is appropriate.
 - h. Mia - I want all the members of the board to be able to state your opinion and you were appointed to make these decisions. Whether what was said whether I agree with it or not, shouldn't happened.

11. ENLACE

- a. Mia - They requested 67920 all going toward employee salaries. My only concern was the mission of the organization as a whole. Their services aren't primarily going toward UNM students.
- b. Victoria: I don't have a problem funding ENLACE because they are employing students and giving the experience.
- c. Nikhil - When was Enlace first receiving funding from SFRB?
- d. Mia- Norma might know
- e. Norma: I will have to look that up, did it not say in their presentation or their packet? If not, I can look it up.
- f. Victoria - When did they first start receiving funding is the question.
- g. Raby - I was in favor in not cutting funding, I know that they were very prominent in my high school and some students do end up working with them in the long term. They do care about high school students that are coming to UNM.
- h. Greg - I agree with that and that the student positions are very important, but I think that anything in terms of funding for what ENLACE does for high schools should be done through enrollment management. I don't think it's fair for student fees to go toward that. I'm a bit reserved toward that and I do think it caters more toward high school students instead of college students.
- i. Victoria - Has any of this been addressed with ENLACE and has anyone asked if they have any other sources of funding?
- j. Mia - I think no, but someone during hearings they asked what services they provided to UNM students and I remember them not having a very solid answer. I don't think it has been addressed. Norma also dropped in the chat that it started in FY19.
- k. Nikhil - The program started in 1999, I feel like it is inappropriate to spend student's money to get more students to us. I don't know how appropriate it is for student fees to be utilized that way.
- l. Raby - On form A. they are only asking for student employees. Going to the relevance on what they do doesn't matter.
- m. Mia - I would like to fund them at the amount last year, I think that the amount that they broken it down was a lot higher than what they would compensate a GA.
- n. Victoria - I agree I think that is a perfect number.

- o. Nikhil - I think last year they were funded 49. and the 39 is the increase in their request. Can we get how many students they are trying to supplement in this request?
- p. Mia -
- q. Nikhil - I am okay with that but I am open for discussion.
- r. Mia - how does the board feel about the 29473 amount?
- s. Rico - I feel the same
- t. Mia - We are trying to find an amount to finalize in parli pro so if there is anyone who has reservations.
- u. Nikhil - Can we round it out to 30000?
- v. Mia - I'm okay with that

12. Athletics

- a. Nikhil - I was more comfortable doing the big units for last but I'm okay with that.
- b. Victoria - Do you all want to do that now or later?
- c. Rico - We are prioritizing the budgets that are taking a significant amount of money.
- d. Victoria - I have a lot of reservations about athletics, I'm going to speak very candidly. My experience with athletics hasn't ever been positive. There is a lot of sketchiness with how they use funding, and when they are addressing the board, they just tell us what we want to hear. I have concerns with their nutrition, and their tutoring. If you look at what they spend on nutrition and tutoring it isn't open to our entire campus. I think it's pushing a big budget that only meets a niche amount of students.
- e. Mia - This is something we are going to have to go line by line. Greg and I did a walk through and they said that nutrition goes toward supplements after the workout.
- f. Victoria - I think that such a large request for such a small amount of students is extreme.
- g. Kyla - I think it is something like 400 athletes and something we talked about last time we talked about how they benefit the campus, and how the profits benefit the campus. If we look at the number on page 11, I know a little more about this since I'm on the team and we are nearly at the bottom, so I think that something we should keep in mind is that we should keep in mind. When the training room is open, you can see a nutritionist and there is a lot more to it than the base level.
- h. Victoria - I know we asked earlier about feeding athletes fast food, I was wondering what your experience is with that? They kind of gave a roundabout answer.
- i. Kyla - I am not a scholarship athlete so I don't receive a lot of things that athletes receive. I know they receive meal plans. AT track meets, we receive things like Jimmy Johns, and I think that why they do fast food because it's faster and cheaper. I can see why it could be concerning for sure.
- j. Greg - With tutoring I thought their answer made sense to me, they talked about how they tried to use CAPS and how their games and schedules didn't meet CAPS schedule. I understood that their tutoring has been a tremendous success in terms of GPA. There are a ton of nutritious elements, that are bought with that line item, I understand why they do it sometimes. There is a 50/50 mix and from my information and talking with people with athletics I don't have a reserve

- on those line items or request.
- k. Rico - I do all things that you said Victoria are concerts to me. If we are looking at Athletics for what it is, money wise, and business wise they bring in the money. These students are not only asked to be a student but to perform at high levels and I do think that funding will help bring money back into our school.
 - l. Nikhil - I understand the need for a special system, but at the same time they shouldn't ask for SFRB funding to fund it. I have one question regarding from revenue from athletics, or does it go back to athletics?
 - m. Mia - Self-gen revenue goes toward departments and they outline that and the expected losses due to games not happening.
 - n. Nikhil - Where does that money go? I don't feel comfortable with funding that.
 - o. Mia - In column D, they are only requesting the amount that is in column E. I&G revenue and private donations, and state funding and the breakdown of what they are requesting are in the slides. They did a better job with the request than the emergency funding.
 - p. Victoria - The difficult thing with their budget is there are only 3 line items. In the PowerPoint they broke it down to multiple things. I am very concerned where they have a line item for other student costs for 180000, but there are departments budget and they didn't even give us a description of it.
 - q. Emma - I had a question for Norma and Tim and I was under the impression that Athletics was working to plan on a deficit, and this is a similar circumstance and we should consider that. I think that requesting right under 200000 if they can't take the time to be more specific about this line item.
 - r. Norma - It was supposed to be paid over 10 years.
 - s. Greg - If anyone had more insight on that line, I don't have thoughts that. I'm pretty sure that athletics is decreasing their budget and the current admin has been doing very well.
 - t. Victoria - They had said access codes
 - u. Norma - They ended their year to pay off their deficit by 2030.
 - v. Emma - Is that 160000 from revenue, or
 - w. Norma - That should be coming from ticket sales, they shouldn't be using student fees to do that.
 - x. Greg - I am unclear on the other student costs but given the numbers I have it should be more than that if it is on access codes and fees. Everything self gen go towards the deficit. I am sure that anything we give them will go to students.
 - y. Emma - I would say that student jobs and helping a student attend college is so much more important than providing resources to student where they could access them on campus such as SHAC, and I am struggling to fund this in full when there are resources on campus that they are asking to fund again.
 - z. Mia - If you could start stating an amount to move this conversation forward. We are in a position to be generous this year.

- aa. Kyla - APACC you said that it was only 3% of the population when that does not also serve a big population. I don't think it's fair to hold that standard. I think we should fully fund at 100%
- bb. Greg - I think that if you want to talk to a department that is hurting do the situation, they have already had to furlough positions and have made sure to keep money going toward students. I'm in favor of the full amount.
- cc. Nikhil - Student Publications are in a debt, and we were really concerned about student publications and we should maybe treat that in the same way too. I know they are working really hard, but maybe we can come to an agreement at the end of deliberations and maybe view it again at the end. I don't think it is a good idea to fund at 100% right now.
- dd. Mia - I agree that on paper they are both running deficits, but there are things that are out of control which may not be in the case.
- ee. Victoria - I don't think that the two are comparable, student publications were only asking for salaries where athletics is requesting funding. I don't think we should outwardly fund departments fully especially if they are not straight forward in what they are requesting. I think personally we need to look at that line item for other. I think it might be excessive, and I know that previous representatives said it should be more than that but not all athletes are on scholarship, since they aren't all. I think we should cut the other student costs for 180000 to 80000
- ff. Greg -
- gg. Victoria - I guarantee you if it was just going towards access codes and student fees that would have an exact number.
- hh. Rico - TO assume that student athletes have the time to come to a resource on campus, I also think that you can't compare the two debts. When the 130000 a year is more than feasible, and I don't think you can say the same in student publications. Their main revenue stream is hurting due to COVID. I'm in support at funding them at 100%
- ii. Emma - I just wanted to add clarification with the board too, last year the line items weren't specific enough they should have taken that recommendation and they clearly didn't. If they aren't willing to be more specific. I don't feel comfortable with funding this at 100%. I would agree in cutting other student costs and cutting it more than that.
- jj. Nikhil - We had the same issue last year I think that funding them in full that we recognize separate from their behavior. I'm in consensus with Victoria and Emma.
- kk. Rico - If that's the only cost that is concerning then we should decrease the funding by 100000 but is there any other reasons since they have been hit so hard.
- ll. Victoria- Where I am coming from, historically in UNM and even prior they haven't been straight forward where it is going and it's the responsibility with this board to be more straight forward, but it will be a punishment saying that if you don't get more specific.
- mm. Nikhil - Athletics are a big thing in the US, but my biggest concern is the transparency as well. I don't feel

comfortable, but this small amount could mean a lot to other resource centers. I think there is a need with athletics that they are competing with other resource centers. I think it is their responsibility to be on par with other requests.

nn. Emma - There are departments that if we just cut the other cost, and that can fund a whole department, and when other departments can go line by line, and that's my main reserve. I haven't seen a lot of progress with what we've been asking for. I am also reserved, and they have been made plenty aware with what we are asking for. That really is why I am the most reserved.

oo. Rico - I still would like to point out that the only thing that has been touched is 100000 to their budget. I think certain things that need to be clarified and that fair, and that's the biggest thing. 100000 in the schemes of things isn't really a slap on the wrist.

pp. Mia - I agree with you Victoria that when asking questions, it was going around in circles. I was planning on making that a formal recommendation. Know that this is something that will be passed on. Is there anymore,

qq. Victoria - I would like to see this lowered more, but I am trying to stay diplomatic since there are people who want to fund in full.

rr. Rico - If you have cuts please let me have them, because we only have one.

ss. Nikhil - Let's not wait for other units let jump in to parli-pro and then something could get stuck again.

tt. Mia - I wouldn't say I would agree with that/

uu. Emma - I'm looking at the funding increase of 848000 but we cut all of the increases like if any department was requesting an increase, I would like to look at the 848000. I understand not wanting to cut that in full, but that is a very large increase to go back up.

vv. Mia - That is an 8.7% increase.

ww. Victoria - I'm on the same page as Emma but we are on the same page where we don't know where the increase is going to hit. I think I would look at nutrition and welfare and ask Emma what other cuts and places when making cuts.

xx. Rico - We are also in a global pandemic, and we can't compare a semester to where they are playing games and then going into another.

yy. Emma - To provide evidence that was something that wasn't addressed this year. I'm looking for the budget.

zz. Victoria - Tim or Norma, do you remember where athletics and what the concerns were for last year.

aaa. Norma - They looked at the nutrition line item, but that what I remember it's about the same discussions.

bbb. Emma - Mental health was a big conversation and wanted to build their resources but I don't remember cutting that specifically. I think that the nutrition that was part of the discussion.

ccc. Greg - In terms of mental health, my understanding is that they were looking for state funding. It was brought up that nutrition was a concern.

ddd. Mia - I want to say to go into budgets to look for places to cut, I see both sides of the argument but if there is no further

- discussion, we are proposing a 100000 cut to their budget.
- eee. Victoria - Personally I would like to see them cut more but I understand the reservations of those on the board. I am fine cutting it 100000 , but if something comes up, we can come to it.
- fff. Emma - Yeah, I'm also fine with that, and something last year.
- ggg.Rico - If there is cuts that you feel need to be discussed, I want to cut more but I don't see where it would be, but I feel like cutting a 100000 just for the sake is not fair how would we justify that.
- hhh.Nikhil - I was kind of recommending other to look in to but if there are people who
- iii. Emma - I think that it is weird that they aren't requesting travel, because that is what we cut last year and now they aren't.
- jjj. Victoria - I would like to justify and I think it's more than fair and that giving them 80000 for other is pushing it. If any other department did that it's holding them to the same standard. Arguing that we shouldn't do that is giving them a privileged position.
- kkk.Nikhil - The main question we should have them submit everything that they are spending, but just to be fair on them and to say that we have that information. If it is possible, I think it's best to ask for all the documentation.
- lll. Mia - To keep this moving forward, we all feel comfortable decreasing 100000.
- mmm. Victoria - I think that since we can fund departments in full, we can start knocking off departments that we don't need to touch.
- nnn.Mia - We can do that.

13. SGAO

- a. Mia - Does anyone have any concerns with SGAE?
- b. Nikhil - I think we should fund them more.
- c. Mia - I was going to say we should look at that at the end.

14. LoboRespect

- a. Mia - Does anyone have any reservations on LoboRESPECT.

15. AISS

- a. Norma - Normally you go line by line and approve, but it sounds that you are trying to get some of this done that you agree on. I think you can highlight in yellow the ones you are okay with.
- b. Mia - Can we highlight the ones that we are in agreement with the same green.
- c. Victoria - I think we are fine not voting on them individually and then voting on it as a whole.

16. Career Services

- a. Mia - Very straight forward and am comfortable funding in full. They planned on using roll over to pay for scholarship
- b. Victoria - I'm fine with that

17. KUNM

- a. Mia - Does anyone have any reservations on KUNM.

18. PNMGC

- a. Mia - Any comments on PNMGC
- b. Victoria - Fine with me.

- c. Mia - I don't want any to feel uncomfortable speaking up, but if you have any comments please let me know.

19. CEC

- a. Mia - This is a department I would like to hear more discussion on. They are requesting a 50% increase from last year. A lot of students did come to support.
- b. Greg - I wanted to talk about them before I left. I felt like their presentation was very thorough, and I think that what they do to our campus and what they do for our campus is extraordinary. I think CEC should be funded where it is requested.
- c. Mia - Is everyone in consensus with approving this at 100%
- d. Nikhil - If the members of the board thinks that the 34000 is worth it, I would agree too, but I am thinking about the student awards.
- e. Mia - They mentioned that the 30000 for student salaries was work study and student awards is not work study.
- f. Victoria - From my understanding it was a stipend to come through as a loophole to be able to fund those.
- g. Mia - Seeing no further discussion I assume everyone is funding it at the full amount.

20. Children's Campus

- a. Mia - Any discussion on Children's Campus?
- b. Sall - This is the only other department I was very passionate about. Their staff do amazing work and think we should completely fund them and send them cookies.

21. LGBTQ Resource Center

- a. Mia - Any discussion or reservations from the board?
- b. Emma - This may be an odd point of discussion, and when we were talking about APACC, I don't think that there is no salary that should be underfunded. I know we don't fund this position, but I was wondering that since we are funding other staff positions elsewhere to give them one-time funding of like 10000, just an idea.
- c. Mia - I think we should bring up ideas at the end to fund more.
- d. Emma - Yeah, I agree, and I just wanted to bring it up and if we have the funding to do so, it would be a good one-time funding.

22. COSAP

- a. Mia - Any concerns on COSAP? I would like to go to parli pro for ENLACE And athletics.
- b. MOTION to go back into Parliamentary Procedure, seconded and Passed Unanimously
- c. MOTION to open Athletics, seconded and passed unanimously

23. Athletics

- a. Nikhil - MOTION to decrease line item 18 by 100,000 to 3,471,257, seconded by Emma. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote
- b. MOTION to table Athletics, seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.
- c. MOTION to open ENLACE, seconded and passed unanimous by voice vote

24. ENLACE

- a. MOTION to decrease in item 27 to 30000, seconded and

passed unanimously by voice vote.

- b. MOTION to move out of parliamentary procedure, seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.

25. GRC

- a. Mia - Is there any comments on this>
- b. Emma - I think that it is fine.
- c. Nikhil - I think it is worth considering giving money back to them at the end.

26. AASS

- a. Mia - I think that is personally a fair request. They requested the same amount after the 18.36% decrease.

27. CAPS

- a. Victoria - I did the tour with CAPS and they did a phenomenal job moving it all online. If you haven't checked it out, I would recommend doing so.
- b. Nikhil - I think it is sensible and should fund it at the full amount.

28. El Centro de la Raza

- a. Mia - Can you clarify why there is two different line items?
- b. Rosenda - They usually request them separate, and they are two different index numbers.
- c. Victoria - Previous SFRB asked to put both in one request.
- d. Mia - Any concerns on CAMP?
- e. Mia - Any comments on the second one?
- f. Victoria - I think both are okay to fund in full.

29. PLF

- a. Mia - Is there any discussion by the board? Since this is a first-time request, and it is primarily for working with students in gen ed classes. Is it important to fund them at 60000 and if it is appropriate to fund them since it is academically centered?
- b. Victoria - Weren't they funded before?
- c. Mia - That was for CEP's whole budget.
- d. Victoria - I would be okay with cutting it a little bit, but I don't have a number and would like to cut more.
- e. Raby - Is it because they are new?
- f. Victoria - I do understand this is different as it is a new program under CEP, but yeah similarly to APACC giving them enough to get off their feet.
- g. Emma - If they take on a specific part of campus, I wouldn't want to hurt what they are trying to do .
- h. Mia - I would be comfortable funding it at 30000 which would give them 7 ½ people.
- i. Victoria - When they presented in the hearings, they identified areas where there are high drop areas, a lot in STEP specifically.
- j. Mia - Can you reiterate how many positions?
- k. Victoria - Six different areas, there needs to be at least sic for them to accomplish their goal.
- l. Mia - I'm still okay with 30000 being generous, that gives them more.
- m. Raby - Yes
- n. Emma - YEs
- o. Tim - They are working with academic affairs and it is focused on core classes, and make sure student get up to

speed and almost providing an assistant instructor.

- p. Victoria - Were these positions funded in full with this grant?
- q. Tim - Yes it was a multimillion-dollar grant.
- r. Victoria - After knowing that I would be fine funding that in full.
- s. Mia - Can you clarify what department what that was under?
- t. Tim - IT was under the STEM individual grant, which is a Title V grant, that is where we have the greatest dropout rate. It was under student affairs, as we transition, and part of the roll is to institutionalize the program. We were transitioning and then got hit with a lack of funding.
- u. Mia - Where does the board stand on this?
- v. Rico - I'm okay to fund this in full

30. FYRE

- a. Victoria - I'm fine with funding this one in full.
- b. Emma - I agree
- c. Victoria - Their request is equal to their budget last year. I think that is okay.
- d. Mia - Do we feel comfortable with adjourning and hearing the rest tomorrow?
- e. Norma - Do we have anymore that you all don't have discussion anymore?
- f. Nikhil - I would like to look at Rec Services and fund it at its fullest.
- g. Mia - I was going to wait until tomorrow as that is a bigger budget, but we can look at it it's very straight forward.

31. Recreational Services

- a. Nikhil - I asked how if we had to make cuts, we would have to look at closing on weekends and that one I think I wanted to add.
- b. Mia - I would be in favor to fund in full, they mentioned they would have to cut hours and make intramurals pay to play.
- c. Victoria - I am okay to fund in full

32. Popejoy

- a. Mia - They are asking for the same from last year after the 18.36% cut. I think that is fair

33. Women's Resource Center

- a. Victoria - I would be okay in also funding this in full.
- b. Mia - I definitely agree. Greg and I did a walkthrough, and they get calls everyday for advocacy. I agree they still get a lot of traffic.

34. GEO

- a. Nikhil - I think that we had some confusion with them
- b. Mia - I would be comfortable funding them at 35000.
- c. Raby - I agree

35. Music Bands

- a. Victoria - I'm fine with funding this in full. If you look at previous budgets, it's actually lower than before.
- b. Mia - I think it's reasonable as well.
- c. Emma - I agree.

36. SUB

- a. Raby - Their scholarships are only offered in house correct?
- b. Victoria - Yes, but they only received funding for SFRB for operations. I would be okay with funding them in full.
- c. Mia - I am a big advocate for the SUB they have transitioned

very well. I wanted to point that out administrative overhead, if we are going to hold athletics to that we should hold the SUB to that.

- d. Mia - I think this is something we should come back to when we are more energized.

37. Libraries

- a. Victoria - I personally am fine with funding them in full. They have 3x greater student participation than athletics and have virtually funding for books.
- b. Raby - AT first I was skeptical with the whole Adobe. They are building a spot in the corner to help with Adobe Creative Cloud.
- c. Mia - Does everyone feel comfortable funding this at 100%?
- d. Victoria - They are only requesting funding for student salaries correct.
- e. Mia - Yes
- f. Victoria - Yeah definitely okay with funding in full.
- g. Mia - We haven't looked at SHAC and the SUB we can do that tomorrow is there anything else?
- h. MOTION to go back into parliamentary procedure, seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.

IV. Closing

- a. Closing comments
None
- b. Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 3:23 PM