

Union Council
2013-2014 Minutes

Meeting Date: December 5, 2013

MEMBERS			
		Nick Checker, ASM Rep	
Neil Damron, President	X	Maria Giannopolus, ASM Rep	
Gary Filipp, VP-Program Admin	X	Sean McNally, ASM Rep	X
Andrew Bulovsky, VP-Public Relations	X	William Lipske, Staff Rep	X
Annie Paul, VP-Leadership Development	X	Peter Lipton, Faculty Rep	X
Mark Guthier, Secretary	X	Jeff Haupt, Alumni Rep	X
Hank Walter, Treasurer	X	Juli Aulik, Alumni Rep	X
Bill Mulligan, WUD Rep	X	Lori Berquam, Dean of Students	
David Gardner, ASM Chair	X	Susan Dibbell, Asst Director-Social Ed	X

Guests: Frances Theisen, Riding Club President, Nathalie McFadden, Director's Office Assistant

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Call to Order	Mr. Damron called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.	
Approval of Minutes	A motion was made to approve the minutes from the 11/14/13 meeting. Motion seconded. All approved.	Motion Passed
Riding Club Update	<p>Ms. Theisen began by stating her two goals: working on sustainability and financial stability. Last year, lesson prices were raised and this year they worked with MUBA to develop a mortgage rate. The Riding Club is also working on turnover with students. Every student must find someone to take their position on the board when they leave. The club has also looked at a mission statement and values, which have been reworked to truly describe the club and the passion the members feel for it.</p> <p>They are planning to meet with MUBA representatives to work on the lease for the stable property to see what MUBA and the Riding club are responsible for, as well as working on the mortgage rate negotiation. Last year, MUBA agreed to pay off the mortgage faster which will cost the club less in the long run.</p> <p>An outdoor arena was built last year and they produced the largest show in the club's history. During last fiscal year, four new horses were donated and the club sold a couple. They currently have the maximum of 18 and there are a couple for sale now. Over the summer, Union facilities staff helped the farm get up to speed on safety and health, which has been fantastic.</p> <p>The stable manager position is currently vacant, however three qualified candidates have interviewed. One person stood out, and will be brought in on January 13th. She noted that it is hard to function without a barn manager.</p> <p>Mr. McNally asked Ms. Theisen to define horsemanship. She stated that horsemanship involves human and horse communication and handling; it creates a partnership. Mr. Guthier asked if there is anything Union Council can do to help. Ms. Theisen said there are many things that the club wants to work on; if they think of anything that Union Council can help with she will let the council know.</p>	

**Union Budgetary
Concerns 2014-
2015**

Mr. Damron noted that this is a discussion, not a decision item. Individuals can state what the Union should be aware of during this process. Mr. Gardner asked about the process. Mr. Walter stated the process begins with campus, who gives the Union info regarding how much we can expect for a budget. We then go to all of the 25 different managers and they build a budget from the bottom up, month by month, day by day. That gets rolled up in a computer program. Mr. Walter and Mr. Guthier spend 2.5-3 days in early January meeting with every manager. He noted that this is not just talking about pennies; it is also talking about implications. Gradually, an overall budget is developed which has to fit in with campus guidelines.

The budget then goes to the Union Council Administrative sub-committee, and then to Union Council for approval. Following approval, the budget goes to SSFC for comments which get sent to the chancellor. The chancellor either approves or disapproves and then it is sent to the Board of Regents. Mr. Guthier and Mr. Walter will come out of the staff budgeting process with recommendations which are a reflection of the Union Budget. Mr. Walter noted that segregated fees are divided into two sections: building ready for use, and general business operating funds.

The facilities area is the primary area in which expenses are increasing. There is no target now, however campus tries to come in with an increase level at or below 3%, and that is generally the guideline that the Union follows. Mr. Walter noted that this will be an interesting budget year because it is largely dependent on what the State Building Commission decides in terms of closing portions of the Memorial Union during this fiscal year. No full time permanent staff will lose their job. There will be some expenses that we don't have normally, and that is still being figured out right now. Mr. Walter stated that they don't anticipate asking for more than 3%, but this will be a very interesting budget year.

Ms. Giannopoulos asked that the budget materials be sent out a week ahead of the meeting. She went on to say that she believes that the chief reveler, the marketing director and production manager for Revelry should receive some sort of compensation for their time and energy.

Mr. Gardner asked if there were ways to communicate with the Administration sub-committee. Mr. Filipp stated that he would put Mr. Gardner on the list serve. Mr. Damron asked if anyone else had concerns they would like to share for this process. Mr. Walter noted that the play circle will open next fall and if we want it to be successful it will cost more money to operate than the old one. He also mentioned that the Union is understaffed in IT. Many departments have struggled with unmet IT needs. These are the kinds of items that we need to consider. Ms. Giannopoulos stated that the play circle needs to be kicked off right. There should be events geared at alumni. Money should be given to a student event planner to give the play circle an identity of its own and to promote arts on campus. Mr. Filipp noted that in addition to the current IT state, investing in software infrastructure to support the business needs is also needed, and it could help with future budget decisions. Mr. Gardner asked if the IT services were in-house. Mr. Guthier stated that some are provided by the Division of Information Technology, which is almost always used for development work. Other services are provided in-house. Mr. Damron asked for other points or suggestions. Mr. Gardner

<p>Upcoming Union Council Dates</p> <p>Decision Items:</p> <p>Union Council Selection Policy Seeking approval of changes to Policy SE3-9 and procedures SE3-9a & SE3-9b</p> <p>WUD structural and budgetary changes 2014-2015</p>	<p>asked if the budget snapshots were the full budget materials available. Mr. Walter stated that the snapshot and the income statement are basically two versions of the same document. Those are year-to-date. There are balance sheets and other statements as well. He noted that Mr. Gardner could have access to additional documents.</p> <p>Mr. Damron stated that the January 30 meeting will be the budget meeting and training for the Union Council officer selection. February 19 will feature the officer selection. On March 13, the incoming officer team will be presenting the slate of directors.</p> <p>Ms. Paul said the committee does not feel that the selection process is broken, however it can be improved. Ms. Dibbell stated that there is only a slight change in policy 3-9. We feel like the policy is relevant and did not make significant changes. She also noted that se3-9a is only reworded. The focus is that the Nominating Committee does the work on behalf of Union Council.</p> <p>Mr. Damron stated that approval of the following two items. The first is there are increased demands for programming with the opening of the west wing and they are looking at creating a Special Events Committee. The committee would provide support to larger events that need advising. The Union would provide financial support.</p> <p>The second decision item is a dollar amount for WUD programing next year. The directors reached out to various committees and identified how much money is needed for their programming next year. They have come up with a reasonable figure. The ideal amount is \$748,326. WUD is asking the Union to meet them half way; half will come from an increase in budget, the other half will come from cutting certain line items. That number would be a place holder to be used in future discussions.</p> <p>The decision items are as follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The creation of a Special Events Committee 2. The approval of a budget of \$726,326 <p>Ms. Giannopoulos asked what budgetary concerns would be aligned with the Special Events Committee. Mr. Filipp stated there is an estimate, but there are a lot of variables, so they are still working on the details. Ms. Giannopoulos asked for the number. Mr. Filipp said a ball park figure would be around \$8,000. That being said, these are estimates based on what other committees have asked for. Mr. Guthier asked if there will be any impact on advising staff. Ms. Dibbell stated that they are potentially looking at hiring a grad student for next summer. Ms. Giannopoulos stated that there needs to be enough money to keep this going, and would like to mitigate constraints before going forward. Mr. Bulovsky stated that he agrees with Ms. Giannopoulos, quality is more important than quantity. He believes that there are too many WUD programs, and he has tried to address that over the past couple of weeks. He noted that money should be spent effectively.</p> <p>Mr. Filipp noted the importance of creating a viable and sustainable model for Revelry, which will be a multi-year process. He would like to create a special line item for Revelry through the conception of a Special</p>	
---	--	--

<p>MUR Enumeration</p>	<p>Events Committee. Ms. Giannopoulos asked where the money for Revelry comes from now. She noted that it was not listed in the summary that was sent out. Mr. Filipp stated that it is not in the budget because it was not brought to the budget for this fiscal year. He went on to say that last year's funds were acquired through fundraising efforts it was outside of Directorate's scope and structure.</p> <p>Mr. Bulovsky asked if the Special Events Committee would be ongoing. Mr. Filipp stated that the reopening of the Union as a whole may change the structure, especially regarding who will be in charge of the play circle. The committee will change over time. He cannot guarantee that the committee will be here or needed long term given the changes that are occurring in the Union as a whole. Ms. Dibbell noted that this should not be the final name. Ms. Paul stated it is difficult to say what the structure of the committees will be pending the impact of construction.</p> <p>Ms. Giannopoulos would like to know if there is a way to better consolidate some of the committees to make programming more cost effective and better in general. Mr. Filipp stated a lot of committees are very large; however the number of members who are fully engaged is a significantly less. They are currently trying to find a consensus that meets everyone's needs, this is the model that Directorate as a whole agreed to. Mr. Bulovsky stated that he is in favor of the proposal. One of the issues WUD faces is that some committees are not as connected to the Union as others, because some activities take place outside of the scope of the Union. He went on to note the danger of creating permanent committees because they do not go away. Having a committee for every single interest makes it difficult to market WUD. He noted that this group needs to be careful to ensure that WUD committees have a clear focus.</p> <p>Ms. Giannopoulos made a motion to approve the decision items. Mr. Bulovsky seconded. Mr. Gardner abstained.</p> <p>Mr. Guthier reminded the group that the current enumeration for Phase II of the Memorial Union project is around \$33 million. This was approved back in 2010 and the scope of Phase I was approved at the same meeting. This approval was based on what we thought we could afford in a private fundraising campaign.</p> <p>We will be going to the State Building Commission with the 35% approved designs in February and would like the increased enumeration of \$36,585,000 to be approved prior to that. If it is not approved, different designs will be presented to the State Building Commission. The new number is more efficient and less expensive in the long run, and better for the campus community as a whole. Mr. Guthier noted that the additional funds would fall on the shoulders of private fundraising. He has already talked to the UW Foundation and the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration. They have both demonstrated their support.</p> <p>Ms. Aulik asked if they were concerned that this would not be enough. Mr. Guthier stated that they do not want to risk asking for too much; this is in the 10% area. He noted that they are also committed to working hard to keep the project as tight as possible. He does not think we are cutting it close or that we would not meet that. Ms. Giannopoulos asked what would be cut out if it was not approved. Mr. Guthier stated it would have to be something big like not doing the fourth floor or not doing floors 2</p>	<p>Motion Passed</p>
-----------------------------------	---	-----------------------------

<p>Reports: Secretary</p>	<p>and 3.</p> <p>Mr. Bulovsky made a motion to approve. Ms. Giannopoulos seconded. All in favor.</p> <p>Mr. Guthier presented a brief fundraising update. With the increase in enumeration, the Union and the Wisconsin Alumni Association have agreed to finish fundraising together with the Union, Alumni Park and Alumni Place projects. The current fundraising gap is \$15 million. In October, there was a very successful campaign for the Annual Fund. Before the next meeting there will be a premiere of the PBS Visionaries Series segment which will occur at the Marquee. Mr. Guthier then shared the finals social marketing campaign. Ms. Aulik asked how the new University alcohol policy will affect the Union. Mr. Guthier noted that it doesn't affect the Union negatively because it actually encourages the use of Union Catering.</p>	<p>Motion Passed</p>
<p>Treasurer</p>	<p>Mr. Walter stated that we budgeted to lose money this year, which we don't like to do, but given everything that has happened with construction and the west wing being closed, it had to be done. He went on to say that we are actually running ahead of projections. Major operating revenue units are running about \$4,000 ahead of budget and \$6,000 ahead of what they were running at last October. The operating budget is \$36 million. Overall, we're about \$500,000 ahead of budget and about \$1 million ahead of last year. Last year there were budget issues that were not anticipated.</p> <p>He went on to discuss why the Union is doing better than expected. Frozen positions, good weather this summer and fall, and changes to the Terrace put us in a better situation. Expenses are also down because capital equipment was not purchased unless it was an emergency or it would pay for itself through revenue.</p> <p>The Union is over budget in the expense area. There are \$170,000 in additional charges from campus. They had over-assessed us and underestimated some other campus departments. If we do as budgeted for the rest of fiscal year, this will just pull us a little bit into the black. Additionally, there are a lot of unknowns about next year. Those revenue generating units on the first floor may be closed for a year which is what we hope, but it could be two. There are unknowns that make us nervous about spending a lot of money. We have planned for this, but some is still up in the air.</p> <p>We are going ahead under the assumption that the State Building Commission will approve our request. Mr. Mulligan asked if the completion date could be written into the contract of the construction manager. Mr. Walter stated that they are proposing to continue Phase I's construction manager at risk, which means that the State can implement a fine if the building is not completed on time. Some things are beyond the control of the contractor including weather and unanticipated conditions.</p> <p>Mr. Damron noted that WUD has discussed potential officer position description changes, which are very minor and logistical. Ms. Giannopoulos asked about the stipend for work done over the summer. Mr. Filipp stated that if work is done over the summer, there should be a</p>	

<p>President</p>	<p>stipend. In the past it has been based on whether or not work is done on campus. Mr. Damron stated that this would be a change. Mr. Guthier noted that these changes had not been discussed at Union Council. Ms. Dibbell noted that she recommended that this should be left vague for position descriptions because they need to get out. Mr. Damron stated that these changes will need to go through Directorate and Union Council Exec before it will be brought back to this group. Ms. Paul noted that everyone will be emailed the new descriptions. Mr. Guthier stated that he wanted to ensure that the language be changed from “summer stipend if on campus.” Ms. Dibbell noted that it could say that summer and academic year stipend will be determined at a later date.</p> <p>Ms. Giannopoulos made a motion to adjourn at 7:35 PM. Mr. Bulovsky seconded. All approved.</p>	<p>Motion Passed</p>
<p>Adjournment</p>		